



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 18]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मई 6, 1995/ वैशाख 16, 1917

No. 18]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1995/VAISAKHA 16, 1917

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन की रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांख्यिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय तथा कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)
(न्यायिक खण्ड)
सूचनाएं

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 1995

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY
AFFAIRS
(Department of Legal Affairs)
(Judicial Section)

NOTICES

New Delhi, the 8th February, 1995

का.आ. 1196—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के
अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है
कि श्री मोती लाल शर्मा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को
उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात
के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला अलवर (राजस्थान) में व्यवसाय
करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार
का आपेक्षित सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर
निहित सूचना से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(23)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

S.O. 1196.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Moti Lal Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Alwar Distt. (Rajasthan).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(23)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1197.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री धर्मपाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नवांशहर (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(24)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 8th February, 1995

S.O. 1197.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Dharam Paul, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Nawanshahar, (Punjab.)

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(24)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1198.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री हसमुख ब्रजलाल मेहता, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बृहद बम्बई (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(25)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 8th February, 1995

S.O. 1198.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Hasमुख Vrajlal Mehta, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Greater Bombay (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(25)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1199.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री मोहिन्दर सिंह सरा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कुरुक्षेत्र (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय

करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(26)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th February, 1995

S.O. 1199.—Notice is hereby given the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Mohinder Singh Sara, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Kurukshetra (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(26)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1200.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रश्मिकान्त विवेकलाल देसाई, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बृहद बम्बई (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(27)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th February, 1995

S.O. 1200.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Rashmikant Viveklal Desai, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Greater Bombay (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(27)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 16 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1201.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री जय भगवान गोयल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पानीपत जिला (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(28)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th February, 1995

S.O. 1201.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Jai Bhagwan Goel, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Distt. Panipat (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(28)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 16 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1202.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री बंजनाथ गुप्ता, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे गुह्ला, कैथल जिला (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(29)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th February, 1995

S.O. 1202.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Jai Nath Gupta, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Guhla, Distt. Kaithal (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(29)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 16 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1203.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सैयद मसूद अहमद, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बी.खोर् कंटोन्मेंट (कर्नाटक) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(30)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th February, 1995

S.O. 1203.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sri Syed Masood Ahmed, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Bangalore, Cantonment (Karnataka).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(30)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 16 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1204.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्रीमति सुनीता फुतेला, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे श्रीगंगानगर (राजस्थान) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(31)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th February, 1995

S.O. 1204.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. Sunita Phutela, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(31)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1205.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री श्रीकृष्ण एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कैथल (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(33)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1995

S.O. 1205.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Shrikrishnan, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Kaithal (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(33)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1206.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री देव राज बनूरा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला न्यायालय राजियाबाद

(उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(34)/95-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1995

S.O. 1206.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Dev Raj Batura, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Distt. Courts Ghaziabad (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(34)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1207.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रविन्द्र अग्रवाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला न्यायालय हिसार (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(35)/95-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd February, 1995

S.O. 1207.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ravinder Aggarwal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Distt. Courts Hissar (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(35)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority
नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1208.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री अशोक कुमार यादव, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे शाहदरा कोर्ट, कड़कड़-डुमा स्थित राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली क्षेत्र में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(36)/95-न्यायिक]
पी. सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1995

S.O. 1208.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ashok Kumar Yadav, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Shahdara Courts at Karkarduma i.e. NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(36)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1209.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री राम कुमार खत्री, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नरेला राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली क्षेत्र में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(37)/95-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1995

S.O. 1209.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ram Kumar Khatri, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Narela i.e. NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(37)/95-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1210.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री मुशील कुमार साहा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला न्यायालय, बरसात, जिला उत्तरी 24, परगना (पश्चिमी बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(38)/95-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1995

S.O. 1210.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Shushil Kumar Saha, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Distt. Judge's Court, Barasat, Distt. North 24, Pargana (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(38)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1211.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री महेश कुमार मंगल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पुण्डी एवं कैथल (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(40)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1995

S.O. 1211.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Mahesh Kumar Mangal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Pundri in and at Kaithal (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(40)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1212.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री विष्णु दास कटारिया, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला फिरोजपुर (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(41)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1995

S.O. 1212.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Vishnu Dass Kataria, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Ferozpur Dist. (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(41)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1213.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री फिरोज अहमद अंसारी एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन

इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सांकली स्ट्रीट, बायकुला बम्बई (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(42)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1995

S.O. 1213.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Firoz Ahmed Ansari, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Sankli Street, Byculla Bombay (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(42)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1214.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री शकीर हुसैन, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कलकत्ता एवं 24 परगना (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(43)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1995

S.O. 1214.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Shakir Hussain, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Calcutta & 24 Pargana (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(43)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1215.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री समीर कुमार साहा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे अलीपुर, जिला 24 परगना दक्षिण (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(44)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1995

S.O. 1215.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Samir Kumar Saha, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Alipuri, Distt. South 24 Parganas (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(44)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 1995

का.आ. 1216:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री प्रेम सागर, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कैथल (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5 (45)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th February, 1995

S.O. 1216.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Prem Sagar, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Kaithal (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(45)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1217:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री श्री. आर. सन्थानाकृष्णन एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मद्रास सिटी (तमिलनाडु) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5 (50)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1995

S.O. 1217.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Q. R. Santhakrishnan, for appointment as a Notary to practise in Madras City (Tamil Nadu).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(50)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1218:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री संतोष कुमार गर्ग, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सिबिल कोर्ट अलीगढ़ (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5 (49)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1995

S.O. 1218.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Santosh Kumar Garg, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Civil Courts Aligarh (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(49)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 9 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1219:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सुन्दर लाल गौतम, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला न्यायालय करनाल (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5 (46)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1995

S.O. 1219.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Sunder Lal Gautam, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Distt. Courts Karnal (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(46)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 9 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1220 :—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री जगन्नाथ गोपीनाथ घुगे, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पूणे (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5 (47)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1995

S.O. 1220.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Jagannath Gopinath Ghuge, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Pune (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(47)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 9 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1221.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री भगवानराव बी. सलुंखे एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे महाराष्ट्र राज्य में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(48)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1995

S.O. 1221.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Bhagwanrao B. Salunkhe, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in State of Maharashtra.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(48)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 10 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1222.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रमेश कालरा एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस

बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(51)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1995

S.O. 1222.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ramesh Kalra, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(51)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 10 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1223.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री कनक लाल कुण्डू, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सिलिगुड़ी सब डिविजन जिला बाजिलिंग पश्चिम बंगाल में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(52)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1995

S.O. 1223.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Kanak Lal Kundu, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Siliguri Sub-Division Distt. Dudgee (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. 5(52)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

नई दिल्ली, 10 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1224.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री धर्मपाल थापर, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिये दिया है कि उसे जादवघर (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिये नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(53)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1995

S.O. 1224.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Dharam Pal Thapar for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jalandhar, (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(53)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1225.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री अशोक कुमार शर्मा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिये दिया है कि उसे बुलन्द शहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिये नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाये।

[सं. एफ. 5(54)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1995

S.O. 1225.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ashok Kumar Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practice Buland-Shahar, (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(54)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1226.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री आर.डी. महेत्रास, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिये दिया है कि उसे कोरेगांव सतरा जिला (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिये नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाये।

[सं. एफ. 5(55)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1995

S.O. 1226.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri R. D. Mhetras, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Koregaon, Distt. Satara (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(55)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1227.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री मनोहर सिंह, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नवांशहर, जलन्धर जिला (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(56)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1995

S.O. 1227.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Manohar Singh, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Nawanshahan Distt. Jalandhar (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(56)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली 21 मार्च 1995

का.आ. 1228.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रणजीत कुमार पाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए किया है कि उसे अलीपुर कोर्ट, जिला 24 परगना (माउथ) पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(57)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1995

S.O. 1228.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ranjit Kumar Pal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Alipore Court, Distt. 24 Parganas (South), West Bengal.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(57)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1229.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री शिव शंकर सोनी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे दीनहता सब डिवीजन, कूच ब्रिहार, पश्चिम बंगाल में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(58)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1995

S.O. 1229.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Shv Shankar Soni, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Dinhat Sub-Division, Cooch Behar (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(58)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1230.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री राजेन्द्र नाथ झा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पटना (बिहार) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(59)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1995

S.O. 1230.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Rajendra Nath Jha, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Patna (Bihar).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(59)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1231.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री नारायण काशीनाथ कार्पे, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक

आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नासिक (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(60)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1995

S.O. 1231.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Narayan Kashinath Karpe, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Nasik (Mharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(60)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1232.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री निर्मल सिंह एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जगाधरी, जिला यमुनानगर (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(61)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1995

S.O. 1232.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Nirmal Singh, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jagadhri Dist. Yamunanagar, (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(61)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 28 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1233.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री अनिल कान्त, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(62)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th March, 1995

S.O. 1233.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Anil Kant, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in MEERUT (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(62)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 28 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1234.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री पी. रामा पाई, एडवोकेट के उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मंगलूर (कर्नाटक) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(63)/95-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कणन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 28th March, 1995

S.O. 1234.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri P. Rama Pai, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mangalore (Karnataka).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(63)/95-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

गृह मंत्रालय

(राजभाषा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1235.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में पशुपालन एवं डेरी विभाग को, जिनके 80 प्र. कर्मचारीवृत्त ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 12022/2/95-रा.भा. (का-2)]

ए.एस. गोदरे, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Official Language)

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1995

S.O. 1235.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use of Official Purposes of the Union)

Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies Development of Animal Husbandry and Dairy Farming ... 80 per cent staff whereof have acquired a working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. 12022/2/95-O.L. (Imp.-II)]

A. S. GODRAY, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली 19 अप्रैल, 1995

का. आ. 1236.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, गृह मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित कार्यालय में हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है।

“कार्यालय कमाण्डेंट -87 बटालियन केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल”

[सं. 12017 / 1 / 95-हिन्दी]

के. सी. कपूर निदेशक

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1995

S.O. 1236.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following Office of the Ministry of Home Affairs where the percentage of Hindi knowing staff has gone above 80 per cent :—

“Office of the Commandant—87 Battalion Central Reserve Police Force”.

[No. 12017/1/95-Hindi]

K. C. KAPOOR, Director

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1995

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1237.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23-ग) के उपखंड (v) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा “जीव प्रकाश विद्यापीठ, नई दिल्ली” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 1992-93, 1993-94 और 1994-95 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अध्वधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखंड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

(i) कर निर्धारिती इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है।

(ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर उल्लिखित कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उप धारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा

तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से इसकी निधि (जेशर जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा।

(iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ के रूप में हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 9723/फा.सं. 197/134/90 आयकर नि-1]

साधना शंकर, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1995

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1237.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Jiv Prakash Vidyapeeth, New Delhi" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objective of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 9723/F. No. 197/134/90-ITA-1]
SADHNA SHANKER, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 29 मार्च, 1995

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1238—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23-ग) के उपखंड (v) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "जीव खालसा दीवान, अमृतसर" को कर-निर्धारण वर्ष 1994-95 से 1996-97 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखंड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (i) कर निर्धारिती इसकी आय का हस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का हस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका

संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है।

(ii) कर निर्धारिती ऊपर-उल्लिखित कर-निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उप-धारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक रंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से इसकी निधि (जेशर-जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;

(iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ के रूप में हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 9735/फा. सं. 197/14/95 आयकर नि-1]

साधना शंकर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th March, 1995

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1238.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Chief Khalsa Diwan, Amritsar" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1994-95 to 1996-97 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 9735/F. No. 197/14/95-ITA-1]
SADHNA SHANKER, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 29 मार्च, 1995

आयकर

का.आ. 1239—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23-ग) के उपखंड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "श्री जैन स्वतंत्र नकोदा पार्श्वनाथ तीर्थ,

1995-96 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अध्वधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखंड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) कर-निर्धारिती इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा इसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए इसका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (2) कर-निर्धारिती ऊपर-उल्लिखित कर-निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से इसकी निधि (जेवर-जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;
- (3) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ के रूप में हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 9736/फा.स. 197/1/94-आयकर नि-1]
साधना शंकर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th March, 1995

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1239.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (v) of clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Shree Jain Swetamber Nakoda Paraswanath Tirth, Mewanagar, Rajasthan" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 1993-94 to 1995-96 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 9736/F. No. 197/1/94-ITA-IJ]
SADHNA SHANKER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1995

(आयकर)

का.आ. 1240.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "पेट्रोलियम

स्पोर्ट्स कंट्रोल बोर्ड, नई दिल्ली" को 1993-94 से 1995-96 तक के कर-निर्धारण वर्षों के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अध्वधीन रहते हुए उक्त खंड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) कर-निर्धारिती उसकी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा उसकी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उसका संचयन इस प्रकार के संचयन हेतु उक्त खंड (23) द्वारा यथा-संशोधित धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) तथा (3) के उपबंधों के अनुरूप पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (2) कर-निर्धारिती ऊपर-उल्लिखित कर-निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (जेवर-जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर अथवा किसी अन्य वस्तु, जिसे उपर्युक्त खंड (23) के तमाम परन्तुक के अधीन बोर्ड द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाए, के रूप में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;
- (3) कर-निर्धारिती अपने सदस्यों को किसी भी तरीके से अपनी आय के किसी भाग का संवितरण अपने से संबंध किसी एसोसिएशन अथवा संस्था को अनुदान के अलावा नहीं करेगा; और
- (4) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हैं जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों।

[अधिसूचना सं. 9750/फा.सं. 196/3/95-आयकर नि-1]

साधना शंकर, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1240.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (23) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies the Petroleum Sports Control Board, New Delhi for the purpose of the said clause for assessment years 1993-94 to 1995-96 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate it for application, in consonance with the provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) of Section 11 as modified by the said clause (23) for such accumulation wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery furniture or any other article as may be notified by the Board under the third proviso to the aforesaid clause (23) for any period during the previous year(s) relevant to the assessment

year(s) mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;

(iii) the assessee will not distribute any part of its income in any manner to its members except as grants to any association or institution affiliated to it; and

(iv) this notification will not apply in relation to any income, being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 9750/F. No. 196/3/95-ITA-I]
SADHNA SHANKER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 अप्रैल, 1995

(आयकर)

का.आ. 1241.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "रोविंग" क्रीड़ा को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ विनिर्दिष्ट करती है

[अधिसूचना सं 9755/का. सं. 196/19/93-आयकर नि.-I]
साधना शंकर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st April, 1995

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1241.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (23) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby specifies the sport 'rowing' for the purposes of the said section.

[Notification No. 9755/F. No. 196/19/93-ITA-I]
SADHNA SHANKER, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1242.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के उपबंध इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 31 मार्च 1999 तक जम्मू सेंट्रल सहकारी बैंक लि., जम्मू पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[का. सं. 1/1/95-ए.सी.]

एम. के. जे. श्रीवास्तव, उप सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 7th April, 1995

S.O. 1242.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of sub-section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply the date of publication of this notification in the official Gazette to the Jammu Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Jammu from to March 31, 1999.

[No. F. 1(1)/95-AC]
S.K.J. SRIVASTAVA, Dy. Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1995

का. आ. 1243.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग), नियमावली, 1976 के नियम-10 के उप-नियम (1) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में स्थित भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके 80 प्रतिशत में अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिभूषित करती है:—

1. मंडल कार्यालय, इलाहाबाद।
2. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-1, इलाहाबाद।
3. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-2, इलाहाबाद।
4. जिला शाखा कार्यालय, इलाहाबाद।
5. सी. ए. बी. कार्यालय, इलाहाबाद।
6. डी. ए. बी. कार्यालय, इलाहाबाद।
7. शाखा कार्यालय, नैनी।
8. शाखा कार्यालय, कटरा (उत्तर प्रदेश)।
9. शाखा कार्यालय, यमुना नगर (उत्तर प्रदेश)।
10. शाखा कार्यालय, भरवारी।
11. शाखा कार्यालय, फूलपुर।
12. शाखा कार्यालय, फतेहपुर।
13. शाखा कार्यालय, बिन्धुखी।
14. शाखा कार्यालय, बांदा।
15. शाखा कार्यालय, अतर्रा।
16. शाखा कार्यालय, कबी।
17. शाखा कार्यालय, प्रतापगढ़।
18. शाखा कार्यालय, कुण्डा।
19. मंडल कार्यालय, बीकानेर।
20. शाखा कार्यालय-1, बीकानेर।
21. शाखा कार्यालय-2, बीकानेर।
22. सी.ए.बी. कार्यालय, बीकानेर।
23. शाखा कार्यालय, चूरू।
24. शाखा कार्यालय, डोडवाना।
25. शाखा कार्यालय, हनुमानगढ़।
26. शाखा कार्यालय, मकराना।
27. शाखा कार्यालय, मेड़ता सिटी।
28. शाखा कार्यालय, नागौर।
29. शाखा कार्यालय, नोहर।
30. शाखा कार्यालय, नोखा।
31. शाखा कार्यालय, रायसिंह नगर।
32. शाखा कार्यालय, रतनगढ़।

33. शाखा कार्यालय, सांगरिया।
34. शाखा कार्यालय, सरदार शहर।
35. शाखा कार्यालय-1, श्रीगंगानगर।
36. शाखा कार्यालय-2, श्रीगंगानगर।
37. शाखा कार्यालय, सुजानगढ़।
38. शाखा कार्यालय, सूरतगढ़।
39. शाखा कार्यालय, सादुलपुर।
40. मंडल कार्यालय-3, नई दिल्ली।
41. शाखा कार्यालय, 11-ए., जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।
42. शाखा कार्यालय-11, जी. रिवाड़ी।
43. शाखा कार्यालय-11-टी., नारायणा, नई दिल्ली।
44. शाखा कार्यालय-11-डब्ल्यू, पश्चिम बिहार, नई दिल्ली।
45. शाखा कार्यालय-11-वाई, नजफगढ़, नई दिल्ली।
46. शाखा कार्यालय-12-ई., नारायणा, नई दिल्ली।
47. शाखा कार्यालय-12-एन., सरस्वती विहार, नई दिल्ली।
48. शाखा कार्यालय-12-एम., इण्डा हेड़ा, गुडगांव।
49. शाखा कार्यालय-12-एन, पालम, नई दिल्ली।
50. शाखा कार्यालय-31-बी., लाजवंती गार्डन, नई दिल्ली।
51. शाखा कार्यालय-33 ए., तिलक नगर, नई दिल्ली।
52. शाखा कार्यालय 33 बी., तिलक नगर, नई दिल्ली।
53. शाखा कार्यालय 122 गुडगांव।
54. शाखा कार्यालय 128 जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।
55. शाखा कार्यालय 129, कीर्ति नगर, नई दिल्ली।
56. शाखा कार्यालय 1041, सोहना।

[सं. 11013/4/94-हि.का.क.]

सुधीर कुमार वर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1995

S.O. 1243.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purposes of the Union) Rule 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, where of more than 80 per cent of staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

1. Divisional Office, Allahabad
2. City Branch Office-1, Allahabad
3. City Branch Office-2, Allahabad
4. Dist. Branch Office, Allahabad
5. C.A.B. Office, Allahabad
6. D.A.B. Office, Allahabad
7. Branch Office, Naini
8. Branch Office, Katra (U.P.)
9. Branch Office, Yamunanagar (U.P.)
10. Branch Office, Bharwari
11. Branch Office, Phoolpur
12. Branch Office, Phatehpur
13. Branch Office, Bindiki
14. Branch Office, Banda
15. Branch Office, Atrra
16. Branch Office, Karvi
17. Branch Office, Pratapgarh
18. Branch Office, Kunda
19. Divisional Office, Bikaner
20. Branch Office-1, Bikaner
21. Branch Office-2, Bikaner

22. C.A.B. Office, Bikaner
23. Branch Office, Churu
24. Branch Office, Didwana
25. Branch Office, Hanumangarh
26. Branch Office, Makrana
27. Branch Office, Medhta City
28. Branch Office, Nagour
29. Branch Office, Nohar
30. Branch Office, Nokha
31. Branch Office, Raisingh Nagar
32. Branch Office, Ratan Garh
33. Branch Office, Sangaria
34. Branch Office, Sardarshaher
35. Branch Office-1, Shriganganagar
36. Branch Office-2, Shriganganagar
37. Branch Office, Sujangarh
38. Branch Office, Suratgarh
39. Branch Office, Sadulpur
40. Divisional Office-III, New Delhi
41. Branch Office-11 A, Janak Puri, New Delhi.
42. Branch Office-11 G, Rewari
43. Branch Office-11 T, Narayana, New Delhi
44. Branch Office-11 W, Paschim Vihar, New Delhi
45. Branch Office-11 Y, Najafgarh, New Delhi
46. Branch Office-12 E, Narayana, New Delhi
47. Branch Office-12 H, Saraswati Vihar, New Delhi
48. Branch Office-12 M, Dundaheda, Gurgaon
49. Branch Office-12 N, Palam, New Delhi
50. Branch Office-31 B, Lajwanti Garden, New Delhi
51. Branch Office-33 A, Tilak Nagar, New Delhi
52. Branch Office-33 B, Tilak Nagar, New Delhi
53. Branch Office-122, Gurgaon
54. Branch Office-128, Janak Puri, New Delhi
55. Branch Office-129, Kirti Nagar, New Delhi
56. Branch Office-1041, Sohana

[No. 11013/4/94-HIC]

S. K. VERMA, Under Secy.

कोयला मंत्रालय

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1244—भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 7¹ मई, 1994 के भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में पृष्ठ क्रमांक 1415 से 1418 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार, कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का.आ.सं. 1057 तारीख 28 मार्च, 1994 में :— पृष्ठ क्रमांक 1415 पर अधिसूचना में :—

पंक्ति 5—5594, 92 के स्थान पर 5594.92 पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ क्रमांक 1416 पर

तालिका में, क्षेत्र (हेक्टर में) स्तम्भ के नीचे।

क्रमिक संख्या 5—“491.947” के स्थान पर “491.946” पढ़ें।

सीमा वर्णन में:—

रेखा "घ" के स्थान पर "घ-ङ" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ क्रमांक 1417 पर रेखा छ-ज में

पंक्ति 1—"बनवारी" के स्थान पर "बगवारी" पढ़ें
रेखा ज1 में,

पंक्ति 2—"ज1" पर मिलती है" के स्थान पर "ज" पर मिलती है" पढ़ें।

रेखा "ड1-ड" के स्थान पर "ड 1-ढ" पढ़ें।

रेखा ड 1-ढ में,

पंक्ति 1, 2—"नकदीटोला" के स्थान पर "नकटीटोला" पढ़ें।
और जहाँ भी "नकदीटोला" शब्द प्रयुक्त हुआ हो उसके स्थान पर "नकटीटोला" पढ़ें।

रेखा ढ-ट1 में,

पंक्ति 2—"ट1" पर मिलती है" के स्थान पर "ढ1" पर मिलती है पढ़ें।

रेखा "थ-क" के स्थान पर "द-क" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 1418 पर—रेखा च-छ-ज-स- में,

पंक्ति 1—"द्वारा संख्यांक 1" के स्थान पर "खसरा संख्यांक 1" पढ़ें। रेखा झ-च में।

पंक्ति 1—"होला और रेवड़ा" के स्थान पर "डोला और खंडा" पढ़ें।

[फा. सं. 43015/19/90-एलएसडब्ल्यू]

नरेन्द्र भगत, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COAL

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 31st March, 1995

S.O. 1244.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal S.O. number 1057 dated the 28th March, 1994, published at pages 1418 to 1420 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 7th May, 1994,—

(1) at page 1418

(a) in line 7, for "Act, he made" read "Act, has made".

(b) in line 10, for "in satisfied" read "is satisfied" and for "5574.92 acres" read "5594.92 acres".

(c) in line 12, for "conferred y" read "conferred by".

(d) in the Schedule, in the Table, in Area in hectares column, in Sl. No. 8, for "650.08" read "650.708".

(2) at page 1419, in the Schedule, under the heading "Boundary description" and sub-heading "M1-N", in line 1, for "Maktitola" read "Naktitola"

(3) at page 1420, in the Schedule, under the heading "Boundary description" and sub-heading "O-P-Q", in line 2, for "boundary of plot number 214", read "boundary of plot number 244".

[No. 43015/19/90-LSW]
N. BHAGAT, Director

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1145.—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 6 अगस्त, 1994 के भाग-II खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) में पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2729 से 2732 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का.आ. 1860 दिनांक 28 जून, 1994 में—
पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2729 पर

1. अनुसूची में "साग्रोनेर" के स्थान पर "सावनेर" पढ़िए। और जहाँ कहीं यह शब्द प्रयुक्त किया हो उसी स्थान पर "सावनेर" पढ़िए।
2. अनुसूची में क्रम सं. 1 ग्राम का नाम स्तम्भ के नीचे "साग्रोनेरी" के स्थान पर "साबंगी" पढ़िए। और जहाँ कहीं यह शब्द प्रयुक्त किया हो उसी स्थान पर "साबंगी" पढ़िए।
3. अनुसूची में क्रम सं. 2 ग्राम का नाम स्तम्भ के नीचे "दुधारवरदी" के स्थान पर "दुधवडी" पढ़िए और जहाँ कहीं यह शब्द प्रयुक्त किया हो उसी स्थान पर "दुधवडी" पढ़िए।

पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2730 पर

4. ग्राम बोरगांव में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक में "280, 281 भाग", के स्थान पर "280 भाग" पढ़िए। और "392 से 394 भाग" के स्थान पर "392 से 394 पढ़िए।

सीमा वर्णन में

5. रेखा ख-ग, में प्लॉट सं. "137 में" के स्थान पर "136 में" पढ़िए। और प्लॉट सं. "171 में" के स्थान पर "172, 171 में" पढ़िए।
6. रेखा ड-च-छ में—"ग्राम फारसोडी (वकील)" के स्थान पर "ग्राम परसोडी (वकील)" पढ़िए और जहाँ कहीं यह शब्द प्रयुक्त किया हो उसी स्थान पर परसोडी (वकील) पढ़िए। और "ओर पंजारे" के स्थान पर "ओर पांजरारो पढ़िए।
7. रेखा छ-क में "ग्राम साग्रोनी" के स्थान पर "ग्राम साबंगी" पढ़िए। और "प्लॉट सं. 139" के स्थान पर "प्लॉट सं. 130" पढ़िए और "प्लॉट सं. 110, 113" के स्थान पर "प्लॉट सं. 110, 111, 113" पढ़िए।

[फा. सं. 43015/24/89-एलएसडब्ल्यू]

नरेन्द्र भगत, निदेशक

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, 31st March, 1995

S.O. 1245.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 1860, dated the 28th June, 1994, published at pages 2729 to 2732 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 6th August, 1994,—

1. at page 2731,—

(a) for "No. O-I(E)II/FR/541-0893" read "No. C-I(E)III/FR/541-0893";

(b) in plot numbers acquired in village Nilgaon for "145, 146 part" read "145 part, 146 part".

2. at page 2732,—

(a) in the boundary description, in line B-C, for "thef" read "then".

(b) in line E-F-G for "Dudhabari" read "Dudhabardi" and for "Panjala" read "Panjara".

[No. 43015/24/89-LSW]

N. BHAGAT, Director

परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग

आदेश

बंबई, 23 मार्च, 1995

का.आ. 1246.—परमाणु ऊर्जा (खाद्य किरणन नियंत्रण) अधिनियम, 1990 के नियम 2 के खंड (ग्री) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं भारत सरकार, परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग की दिनांक 28-7-1993 एवं 10-2-1995 की अधिसूचनाओं के अधीन केन्द्रिय सरकार द्वारा कथित नियमों के द्वारा अनुज्ञापन प्राधिकारी को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उपयोग करने के लिए संयुक्त सचिव, परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग को अनुज्ञापन प्राधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एईए/17(1)/93-ईएर (खंड-II)/708]

कृ. जूथिका पाटणकर, अवसर सचिव

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ORDER

Bombay, the 23rd March, 1995

S.O. 1246.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (o) of rule 2 of the Atomic Energy (Control of Irradiation of Food) Rules, 1990, and in supersession of the notifications of the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy dated 28-7-1993 and 10-2-1995, the Central Government hereby appoints Joint Secretary, Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, as the Licensing authority to exercise the powers conferred on the licensing authority by the said rules.

[No. AEA/17(1)/93-ER(Vol. II)/708]

KUM. JUTHIKA PATANKAR, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1247.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का. आ. संख्या 2686, तारीख 08 अक्टूबर, 1994 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के प्रयोजन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनार्थ उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 31 अक्टूबर, 1994 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (i) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को नोट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आगे यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के अलावा सभी विलंगमों में मुक्त इंडियन प्राइमल को-पारिशड लिमिटेड में निहित होगा

अनुसूची

तहसील : सांगानेर जिला : जयपुर राज्य : राजस्थान

गांव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेंटी आरे
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पालड़ी गीता	241	0	02	00
	242	0	00	22
	243	0	01	44
	268	0	02	80

तहसील : जयपुर जिला : जयपुर राज्य : राजस्थान

गांव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेंटी आरे
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
जयसिंह पुराखोर	528	0	08	10
	2122	0	03	68
	2134	0	07	20
	2157	0	12	00

तहसील : भामेर	जिला : जयपुर	राज्य : राजस्थान			तहसील : भादपुरा	जिला : जयपुर	राज्य : राजस्थान		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	मनोहरपुर	7799	0	02	08
भामेर	4111	0	15	00	7800	0	03	30	
	4181	0	07	50	7803	0	02	10	
	4175	0	48	60	7804	0	25	20	
	4189	0	03	41	7805	0	01	65	
	4192	0	09	00	8126	0	07	80	
	4195	0	02	40	8129	0	12	90	
	5549	0	01	20	8130	0	01	54	
					8131	0	15	60	
धनरोल	871	0	00	36					
	875	0	30	60					
	919	0	04	80					
	939	0	07	20					
	942	0	01	50					
	943	0	06	00					
	944	0	03	30					
	946	0	02	10					
	947	0	03	36					
स्यारी	31	0	03	08					
	36	0	04	48					
जुगलपुरा	152	0	20	04					
	158	0	06	60					
	159	0	09	00					
	165	0	03	60					
	150/207	0	22	50					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)					
सासर बास	51	0	00	84					
	52	0	10	50					
	53	0	20	88					
	54	0	03	60					
(3)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)				
लखेर	242	0	07	05					
	242/306	0	21	00					
	245	0	08	70					
	100	0	07	80					
	104	0	51	60					
	111	0	09	60					
भबाना	806	0	01	80					
तहसील : जमवारामगढ़	जिला	जयपुर : राज्य राजस्थान							
भादपुर कला	273	0	15	00					
	482	0	09	60					
	483	0	04	20					
	489	0	07	80					
	382	0	02	40					
तहसील : विराटनगर	जिला : जयपुर	राज्य : राजस्थान							
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)					
सुरपुरा	783	0	04	34					
	601/985	0	04	48					
बडौदा	349	0	16	50					
	354	0	00	98					
	355	0	14	92					
भाभरू	595	0	02	00					
	596	0	02	80					
	597	0	06	66					
	599	0	06	24					
	600	0	00	32					
	693	0	06	90					
	694	0	00	08					
	698	0	09	10					
	699	0	00	08					
	1023	0	00	04					
	1021	0	06	40					
	1022	0	08	28					
	1024	0	08	10					
	1025	0	07	80					
	1026	0	06	30					
	1027	0	01	20					
	1031	0	03	74					
	1032	0	03	42					
	1033	0	00	90					
	1034	0	10	50					
	2917	0	02	40					
	2924	0	01	80					
	2925	0	03	90					
	2926	0	00	24					
	2927	0	02	00					
	2929	0	04	00					
	2963	0	05	28					
	2964	0	09	00					
	2968	0	01	96					
	2972	0	16	40					
	2973	0	02	80					
	2981	0	05	30					
	2982	0	00	80					
	2983	0	06	30					
	2978	0	08	10					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2995	0	02	70
	2996	0	02	70
	2999	0	04	20
	3002	0	01	20
	3012	0	12	12

तहसील : कोटपुतली जिला : जयपुर राज्य : राजस्थान

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पावडा	925	0	03	00
	929	0	03	00
	930	0	06	90
	2123	0	15	30
	2130	0	06	60
	2131	0	06	15
	2129/2386	0	16	65
कनवरपुरा	770	0	00	21
	771	0	03	36
	772	0	00	7
	826	0	03	08
बृन्नाहेडा	65	0	03	50
	68	0	00	14
	616	0	03	64
सोगटेडा	1150	0	01	26
	1158	0	02	10
	1163	0	00	98
	1170	0	02	38
धनयाला	1375	0	09	00
	1381	0	12	00
	1716	0	06	90
	1738	0	04	50
भलपुरा	54	0	11	70
	55	0	10	80
	58	0	13	50
	81	0	05	70
	83	0	13	50
	88	0	00	90
	89	0	07	80
	93	0	07	20
	94	0	05	40
	95	0	04	80
	97	0	05	20
	98	0	05	40
	99	0	00	96

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	101	0	07	80
	102	0	05	04
तहसील : बहरोड़	जिला : झलवर	राज्य : राजस्थान		
नगला खंख	222	0	04	20
	287	0	02	80
जमकसिंह पुरा	151	0	00	28
	152	0	03	50
	183	0	02	80
जैनपुरवात	96	0	04	80
	98	0	09	00
	99	0	07	50
	106	0	01	05
	108	0	05	00
	97	0	00	04
पूसी	2132	0	00	90

[नं. मार 31015/44/93/कोमार-I]

के० सी० कटोच, सवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O.1247.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 2686, dated the 08th October, 1994, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transport of petroleum;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 31st October, 1994;

And whereas the Competent Authority in pursuance to sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act has made his report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest free from all encumbrances, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Sanganer District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
		Hec- tare	Are	Centi- tare
1	2	3	4	5
Parli Mina	241	0	02	00
	242	0	00	22
	243	0	01	44
	268	0	02	80
Tehsil : Jaipur District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
Jaisinghpura Khor	528	0	08	40
	2122	0	03	68
	2134	0	07	20
	2157	0	12	00
Tehsil : Amber District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
Amber	4111	0	15	00
	4181	0	07	50
	4175	0	48	60
	4189	0	03	41
	4192	0	09	00
	4195	0	02	40
	5549	0	04	20
Achrol	874	0	00	36
	875	0	30	60
	919	0	04	80
	939	0	07	20
	942	0	01	50
	943	0	06	00
	944	0	03	30
Syari	946	0	02	10
	947	0	03	36
	31	0	03	08
	36	0	04	48
Jugalpura	152	0	20	04
	158	0	06	60
	159	0	09	00
	165	0	03	60
	150/207	0	22	50
Salarwas	51	0	00	84
	52	0	10	50
	53	0	20	88
	54	0	03	60
Lakher	242	0	07	50
	242/306	0	21	00
	245	0	08	70
	100	0	07	80
	104	0	51	60
Labana	111	0	09	60
	806	0	01	80

Tehsil : Jamwaramgarh District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
1	2	3	4	5
Bhanpur Kalan	273	0	15	00
	482	0	09	60
	483	0	04	20
	489	0	07	80
	382	0	02	40
Tehsil : Shahpur District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
Manoharpur	7799	0	02	08
	7800	0	03	30
	7803	0	02	10
	7804	0	25	20
	7805	0	01	65
	8126	0	07	80
	8129	0	12	90
	8130	0	01	54
	8131	0	15	60
Tehsil : Virat Nagar District : Jaipur State : Rajasthan				
Surpura	783	0	04	34
	601/995	0	04	48
Baroda	349	0	16	50
	354	0	00	98
	355	0	14	92
Bhabru	595	0	02	00
	596	0	02	80
	597	0	06	66
	599	0	06	24
	600	0	00	32
	693	0	06	90
	694	0	00	08
	698	0	09	10
	699	0	00	08
	1023	0	00	04
	1021	0	06	40
	1022	0	08	28
	1024	0	08	10
	1025	0	07	80
	1026	0	06	30
	1027	0	01	20
	1031	0	03	74
	1032	0	03	42
	1033	0	00	90
	1034	0	10	50
	2917	0	02	40
	2924	0	01	80
	2925	0	03	90
	2926	0	00	24
	2927	0	02	00
	2929	0	04	00
	2963	0	05	28
	2964	0	09	00
	2968	0	01	96
	2972	0	16	40
	2973	0	02	80
	2981	0	05	30
	2982	0	00	80
	2983	0	06	30
	2978	0	08	10
	2995	0	02	70

1	2	3	4	5
	2996	0	02	70
	2999	0	04	20
	3002	0	01	20
	3012	0	12	12
Tehsil : Kotputli	District : Jaipur	State : Rajasthan		
P a a t	925	0	03	00
	929	0	03	00
	930	0	06	90
	2123	0	15	30
	2130	0	06	60
	2131	0	06	15
	2129/2386	0	16	65
Kanwarapura	770	0	00	21
	771	0	03	36
	772	0	00	70
	826	0	03	08
Buchabeda	65	0	03	50
	68	0	00	14
	616	0	03	64
Sangrda	1150	0	01	26
	1158	0	02	10
	1163	0	00	98
	1170	0	02	38
Panyala	1375	0	09	00
	1381	0	12	00
	1716	0	06	90
	1738	0	04	50
Malpura	54	0	11	70
	55	0	10	80
	58	0	13	50
	81	0	05	70
	83	0	13	50
	88	0	00	90
	89	0	07	80
	93	0	07	20
	94	0	05	40
	95	0	04	80
	97	0	05	20
	98	0	05	40
	99	0	00	96
	101	0	07	80
	102	0	05	04

Tehsil : Behror	District : Alwar	State : Rajasthan		
Nagla Rundh	222	0	04	20
	287	0	02	80
Janaksinghpura	151	0	00	28
	152	0	03	50
	183	0	02	80
Jainpurawas	96	0	04	80
	98	0	09	00
	99	0	07	50
	106	0	01	05
	108	0	05	00
	97	0	00	04
Gunti	2132	0	00	90

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1995

का.प्रा. 1248-केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पापइलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, (1962 का 50) की (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.प्रा. 2397 तारीख 17 सितम्बर, 1994 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनार्थ उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 29 सितम्बर, 1994 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिये;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आगे यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय सभी विल्लगमें से मुक्त, इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा :—

अनुसूची

तहसील : रेवाड़ी,	जिला : रेवाड़ी,	राज्य : हरियाणा			
गांव का नाम	हदबस्त में.	मुस्तसील किला नं.	क्षेत्रफल		
—			हेक्टर	आर	सैंटीमीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
बांग	238	13	06	00	10 62
			15	00	11 13
			16	00	10 00
			25	00	04 05
			14		
			10	00	01 26

हस्तील : रोहतक	जिला : रोहतक	राज्य : हरियाणा			
1	2	3	4	5	6
कुलनामा	16	337	00	06	32
तहसील गोहाना	जिला : सोनीपत	राज्य : हरियाणा			
मैसवाल कला मिठान	68	108			
		10	00	07	59
नायत	62	61			
		9	00	02	28
तहसील : पानीपत	जिला : पानीपत	राज्य : हरियाणा			
बुमनावाखू	86	72			
		18	00	05	06
गयथ	91	48			
		3	00	09	36
शाहपुर	89	20			
		9	00	00	03
कारव	64	92			
		10	00	06	88
		122			
		3	00	02	28
कालखी	41	18			
		5	00	06	83
		6	00	9	36
		44			
		3	00	02	78
		8	00	09	36
		13	00	03	79
		18	00	10	12
		19	00	02	53
		22/2	00	02	78
		23	00	00	25
सुताना	23	66			
		15	00	01	26
		16	00	01	77
कंटला	44	14			
		22	00	06	07
भासन छुदे	22	24			
		22	00	09	11
		34			
		2	00	06	58

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1248.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 2397, dated the 17th September, 1994 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) hereinafter referred to as the said Act, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transport of petroleum;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 29th September, 1994;

And whereas the Competent Authority in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has made his report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, free from all encumbrances, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited :—

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Rewari District : Rewari State : Haryana					
Name of Village	Had bast No.	Mustateel/ Killa No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	6
Chang	238	13			
		6	00	10	62
		15	00	11	13
		16	00	10	88
		25	00	04	05
		14			
		10	00	01	26
Tehsil : Rohtak District : Rohtak State : Haryana					
Kultana	16	337	00	06	32
Tehsil : Gohana District : Sonapat State : Haryana					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Bhainawal	68	108			
KalanMithan					
		10	00	07	59
Nayat	62	61			
		9	00	02	28

Tehsil : Panipat District : Panipat State : Haryana					
Bowana Lakhu	86	72		00	05 06
		18			
Kayath	91	48		00	09 36
		3			
Shahpur	89	20		00	00 03
		9			
Karad	64	92			
		10		00	06 83
		122		00	02 28
		3			
Kalkha	41	18		00	06 83
		5			
		6		00	09 36
		44			
		3		00	02 78
		8		00	09 36
		13		00	03 79
		18		00	10 12
		19		00	02 53
		22/2		00	02 78
		23		00	00 25
Sutana	23	66		00	01 26
		15			
		16		00	01 77
Untla	44	14		00	06 07
		22			
Asan Khurd	22	24		00	09 11
		22			
		34		00	06 58
		2			

[No. R-31015/41/93-O.R-I (Part-I)]
K.C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1995

का.प्रा. 1249:- केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई और भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) के पृष्ठ सं. 2840 से 2842 और 2844 से 2846 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस-मंजालन की अधिसूचना सं. का.प्रा. 1953 और का.प्रा. 1954 तारीख 13 अगस्त 1994 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी :

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की जानकारी में यह बात लाई गई

है कि राजपत्र में उक्त अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन में मुद्रण-प्रकृति की कुछ गलतियाँ हो गई हैं।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए इन अधिसूचनाओं से संलग्न अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन करती है :—

पृष्ठ 2840 ।

अधिसूचना सं. का.प्रा. 1953 की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 के नीचे गांव का नाम "जाड़ा" के स्थान पर "बाड़ा" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ 2 के नीचे खसरा नं. 515 के सामने स्तम्भ संख्या 4 में "21" के स्थान पर "12" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ 2841

अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 के नीचे गांव का नाम "भीमान" के स्थान पर "भीमाना" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ 2 के नीचे खसरा नं. 2081 के सामने स्तम्भ 4 में "17" के स्थान पर "47" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ सं. 2842

अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 के नीचे का गांव का नाम "कदरना" के स्थान पर "कोदरला" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ सं. 2844

अधिसूचना सं. का.प्रा. 1954 की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 के नीचे खसरा नं. "484" के स्थान पर "584" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ सं. 2845

स्तम्भ संख्या 1 में गांव का नाम "मोयरला" के स्थान पर "मोरथला" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ संख्या 3 में गांव किवरली के खसरा नं. 634 के सामने "0" के स्थान पर "1" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ संख्या 5 में गांव किवरली के खसरा नं. 846 के सामने "78" के स्थान पर "28" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ संख्या 4 के नीचे गांव किवरली के खसरा नं. 927 के सामने "00" के स्थान पर "02" पढ़ें।

स्तम्भ संख्या 4 के नीचे गांव किवरली के खसरा नं. 929 के सामने "02" के स्थान पर "06" पढ़ें।

ऐसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत उपरोक्त संशोधन जारी किया गया है, हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति इस अधिसूचना के जारी किए जाने के इक्कीस दिन के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार उक्त भूमि के सम्पूर्ण या किसी भाग के या उक्त ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किसी अधिकार का अर्जन किए जाने के विरुद्ध लिखित में आक्षेप कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण :- इस अधिसूचना के द्वारा संशोधित भूमियों और मुस्ततील/खसरा सं. की बाबत ही उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार

इक्कीस दिन की उक्त अवधि उक्त तारीख से आरम्भ होती है जिसको यह अधिसूचना राजपत्र के प्रकाशन के पश्चात जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है।

[सं. भार-31015/44/93-ओ.आर.-1(पाठ-I)]

के.सी. कटोच, अवर सचिव

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1249.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 1953 and S.O. 1954, dated the 13th August, 1994, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), at pages 2842 to 2844 and 2846 to 2847 issued under section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification;

And, whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to these notifications as follows:—

In notification No. S.O. 1953, at page 2843, in village Dhanari against Khasra No. 2087/1911, in column 5, for '0' read '04', against Khasra No. 1942, in column 4 for '0' read '09';
00';

In notification No. S.O. 1954, at page 2846, in village Tართლი against Khasra No. 391, in column 4, for '90' read '00';

Any person interested in any land in respect of which the above amendments have been issued may within twenty one days of the issue of this notification, object in writing to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the said land or any right in or over such land in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act.

Explanation.—In respect of the lands, Khasra Nos. and area amended through this notification only the said period of twenty one days in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act starts running from the date the notification is made available to the public after publication in the Official Gazette.

[No. R-31015/44/93-OR-I(Pt.-I)]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

सूचि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1995

का.भा. 1250.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी और भारत के राजपत्र के भाग-2 खण्ड-3, उपखण्ड (ii) की पृष्ठ संख्या 5259 से 5270 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का.भा.सं. 3551, तारीख

31 दिसम्बर, 1994 द्वारा यह घोषित किया कि उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की जानकारी में यह लाया गया है कि राजपत्र में प्रकाशित उक्त अधिसूचना में मुद्रण संबंधी कुछ गलतियाँ हैं;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन करती हैं:

पृष्ठ संख्या 5266 : गांव का नाम "पोलमी" के स्थान पर "पोलंगी" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 5269 : इसराना गांव के स्तम्भ 2 के नीचे हदबस्त नं. "66" के स्थान पर "66, 67" पढ़ें।

यह और कि केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आगे यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय सभी बिलिंग्सों से मुक्त होकर, इंडियन प्रायल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

[संख्या भार 31015/2/94-ओ.आर. 1]

के.सी. कटोच, अवर सचिव

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1250.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 3551, dated the 31st December, 1994, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), at pages 5259 to 5281 issued under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared that the right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to the notification for the purpose of laying pipelines for the transport of petroleum should be acquired;

And, whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Gazette;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the said notification as follows:—

at page 5273, in village Kahnori, against killa no. 19/1, in column 6, for '3' read '36', in village Ahri, against killa no. 7/1, in column 6, for '0' read '05', in village Dadampur, against killa no. 4, in column 6, for '18' read '81', in column 1, for the word "Palungi" read "Polungi";

at page 5277, in village Polungi, in column 3, before kila no. 7 insert Mustateel No. 7.

at page 5278, in village Jauli, in column 6, against killa no. 7, for '56' read '26'.

at page 5279, in village Iarana, in column 2, for Hadbast No. '66' read '66, 67'.

at page 5280, in column 1, for the word 'Sultana' read 'Sutana'.

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government. Vest free from all encumbrances in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

[No. R-31015/294-OR-I]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1251.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 2686, dated 08th October, 1994, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) at page 4202 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the land specified in the Schedule appended to the notification ;

And, whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the said notifications as follows :—

at page 4202, in village Manoharpur, in column 2, for Khasra No. '8116' read '8126' ;

Any person interested in any land in respect of which the above amendment has been issued may within twenty one days of the issue of this notification, object in writing to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the said land or any right in or over such land in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act.

Explanation.—In respect of Khasra No. amended through this notification only, the said period of twenty one days in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act starts running from the date the notification is made available to the public after publication in the Official Gazette.

[No. R-31015/44/93-OR-I (Pt.-I)]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1252.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 3552, dated 31st December, 1994, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), at pages 5283 to 5284, issued under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification;

And whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the said notification as follows :—

at page 5284, in village Talwad Sarviland Momampur, against Khasra No. 1434, in column 6, for '06' read '60' ;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government. Vest free from all encumbrances in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

[No. R-31015/44/93-OR-I (Pt. D)]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1253.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, डा. गुरुप्रताप सिंह, संकायाध्यक्ष, आयुर्विज्ञान संकाय और प्रधानाचार्य, गवर्नमेंट मेडिकल कालेज, पटियाला, को पंजाबी विश्वविद्यालय के सीनेट द्वारा 26 नवम्बर, 1994 से भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, का.आ.सं. 138, तारीख 9 जनवरी, 1960 के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की अधिमूचना में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिमूचना में, धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन निर्वाचित शीर्षक के नीचे, क्रम संख्यांक 28 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्यांक और प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

"28. डा. गुरुप्रताप सिंह,

प्रधानाचार्य,

गवर्नमेंट मेडिकल कालेज,

पटियाला, पंजाब।"

[सं. बी-11013/7/95-एम० ई० (यू० जी०)]

एस.के.मिश्रा, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 18th April, 1995

S.O. 1253.—Whereas in pursuance of the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) Dr. Gurpartap Singh, Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Principal Government Medical College, Patiala has been elected by the Senate of the Punjabi University to be a member of the Medical Council of India with effect from the 26th November, 1994.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendments in the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Health published under S.O. No. 138, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3, for serial number

28 and entry relating thereto, the following serial number and entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“28. Dr. Gurpartap Singh,
Principal,
Government Medical College,
Patiala,
Punjab.”

[No. V-11013/7/95-ME(UG)]
S. K. MISHRA, Desk Officer

नागर विमानन और पर्यटन मंत्रालय

(नागर विमानन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1254—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में, नागर विमानन तथा पर्यटन मंत्रालय (नागर विमानन विभाग) के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन एयर इंडिया के उत्तरी क्षेत्र के अमृतसर स्टेशन को, जिनके कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या ई-11011/6/88-हिन्दी]

रघुनाथ सहाय, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION & TOURISM

(Department of Civil Aviation)

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

S.O. 1254.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for the Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the office of Amritsar Station of Air India, Northern Region, under the administrative control of Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism (Department of Civil Aviation), the staff of which have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. E-11011/6/88-Hindi]

RAGHUNATH SAHAI, Director (O.L.)

रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1255—राजभाषा नियम, 1976 (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) के नियम 10 के उपनियम (2) और (4) के अनुसरण में रेल मंत्रालय, रेलवे बोर्ड, उत्तर तथा पूर्व रेलों के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जहाँ कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करता है :—

उत्तर रेल (फिरोजपुर मंडल) :

1. रेल स्टेशन, फगवाड़ा
2. वरिष्ठ चिकित्सा अधीक्षक कार्यालय, जालंधर छावनी
3. रेल स्टेशन, जालंधर छावनी

4. सहायक इंजीनियर-I कार्यालय, फिरोजपुर
5. सहायक इंजीनियर-II कार्यालय, फिरोजपुर
6. मुख्य चिकित्सा अधीक्षक कार्यालय, फिरोजपुर
7. रेल स्टेशन, ठंडारी कलां
8. रेल स्टेशन, मोगा
9. रेल स्टेशन, जगरांव

पूर्व रेल (धनबाद मंडल) :

10. वरिष्ठ मंडल विद्युत इंजीनियर (कर्मण चल रटाक) कार्यालय, गोमो
11. सहायक इंजीनियर, गोमो
12. सहायक मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, हजारी बाग रोड

[सं. हिन्दी-95/रा.भा. 1/12/1]

एस.ए. ए. जैदी, सचिव, रेलवे बोर्ड

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1995

S.O. 1255.—In pursuance of sub-Rules (2) and (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for the Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) hereby notify the following Offices of Northern and Eastern Railways, where the staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

NORTHERN RAILWAY (FEROZEPUR DIVISION)

1. Railway Station, Phagwara
2. Office of the Senior Medical Supdt., Jullandhar Cantt.
3. Railway Station Jullandhar Cantt.
4. Office of the Assistant Engineer-I, Ferozepur
5. Office of the Assistant Engineer-II, Ferozepur
6. Office of the Chief Medical Supdt., Ferozepur
7. Railway Station, Dhandari Kalan
8. Railway Station, Moga
9. Railway Station, Jagraon.

EASTERN RAILWAY (DHANBAD DIVISION) :

10. Office of the Senior Divisional Electric Engineer (Rolling Stock Traction), Gomoh
11. Assistant Engineer, Gomoh
12. Office of the Assistant Divisional Medical Officer, Hazaribagh Road.

[No. Hindi-95/OL-I/12/1]

S.A.A. ZAIDI, Secy., Railway Board

धम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 7 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1256—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एयर इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (ख.०I), बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-11012/4/91-आई आर (विविध)]

आई आर (कोल-I)

अज मोहन, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 7th April, 1995

S.O. 1256.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. D, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Air India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-4-1995.

[No. L-11012/4/91-IR (Misc.)/IR. (Coal-I)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-74 of 1992

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Air India.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Management—Shri A. Kulkarni, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri Yelkar, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Airlines

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, dated the 27th day of March, 1995

AWARD

Government of India, Ministry of Labour has referred dispute mentioned in schedule below for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the action of the management of Air India in terminating the services of Mr. S. R. Pande, Loader, St. No. 6717 of Grounds Services Dept. with effect from 31st May, 1984 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. Admitted position is that Shri Pande, the workman came to be employed as Loader by order dated 21-12-1978 on the establishment of Air India. He was appointed on probation initially and later confirmed.

3. By chargesheet dated 24th February, 1984, he was charged with a 'misconduct' consisting of habitual absence without permission for 93 days. His explanation was called for and found not satisfactory, enquiry was directed. At the end of the enquiry, during which he admitted the charge, he was held guilty of misconduct and the Competent Authority accepted the findings of the Enquiry Officer and imposed penalty and it is this that he has challenged by filing statement of claim.

4. In the statement of claim filed he contends that the Deputy Director, Ground Services was not competent to initiate departmental proceedings and therefore, the action taken pursuant to that enquiry and its findings is bad, illegal, void-ab-initio. He therefore, on that ground prays for setting aside that order. He has also contended that the termination order is bad on the ground that it is a case of victimisation, based on patently false and trumped up allegations of absence without leave. According to him, enquiry was not conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and with undue haste. He has also contended that it was not proper and fair and that the Enquiry Officer's findings are perverse. According to him, having regard to the nature of alleged and proved misconduct, the penalty is shockingly disproportionate.

5. The management has filed written statement challenging the allegations made by the workman in the course of his statement of claim. At the out set it is contended that the action has been taken in May 1984 and after a long period of 6 years and for which no explanation is given the dispute has been raised. This delay itself, according to the management, is sufficient to reject the reference.

6. It is then stated that he was appointed on probation in December 1978 and his work was not satisfactory so far as attendance was concerned during the first half of the probationary period. He was required to be cautioned to show improvement in attendance and when it was found that there was some improvement he was confirmed with effect from 1-6-1979. In spite of this his attendance continued to be irregular necessitating warning letters given to him.

7. The management issued chargesheet in this particular case and held an enquiry which was fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and he also pleaded guilty to the charge in that enquiry and thereafter the adverse report made by the Enquiry Officer to the Competent Authority came to be accepted and penalty imposed. Thus it is the contention of the management that the punishment awarded should not be disturbed while submitting that the same was warranted in view of the past conduct of the delinquent employee who was required to be punished earlier for similar misconduct, and dealt with leniently because of his assurance that he would improve his conduct. It is also submitted that the enquiry was directed by Competent Authority and even otherwise that would not vitiate ultimate action taken which has been taken by a Competent Authority.

8. Submissions have been made on either side.

9. The admitted position is that the delinquent employee was chargesheeted for misconduct consisting of habitual absence without permission for 93 days. This misconduct is mentioned in Clause 42(vi). That is "Absence without leave or overstaying the sanctioned leave without sufficient grounds or proper or satisfactory explanation or absence from the employee's appointed place or work without permission or sufficient cause". This charge was enquired into by the Enquiry Officer and it is evident from the copy of the proceedings that he was explained that charge a copy of which he had already received and thereafter asked whether he had given any explanation and he told the Enquiry Officer that he had. Thereafter he was asked whether he wished to say anything in addition to what he had stated in his explanation and to which he replied "I admit the charge mentioned in the letter No. GS/06-01/3117 dated 24th February, 1984." Thereafter he was again asked whether he was admitting that charge voluntarily and without inducement or coercion from anybody and the reply is "Yes, I admit the charge of my own free will". It appears that thereafter in spite of this admission the Committee thought it proper to verify correctness of the details of the absence without permission mentioned in the chargesheet as recorded by the Time Office and accordingly Mrs. Muley, Office Asst. Time Office was called in to give evidence. She was asked to make statement of facts relating to the charge which was read over to her and she made that statement on the basis of record available in the Time Office and confirmed that Shri Pande was absent from work for 92 days as detailed in the chargesheet. She added that he was absent in addition on 31st October 1983. She, thereafter, stated that Shri Pande has not regularised his absence for all those 93 days. Thereafter, Shri Pande was given opportunity to cross-examine her and he declined and thereafter, Mrs. Muley was discharged.

10. The Enquire Officer then gave an opportunity to Shri Pande to make a final statement and he did that. He gave some reasons for his absence but did not dispute the fact of his absence. At the end of his enquiry, Enquiry Officer made a report and Shri Pande was given an opportunity to give his say which he did and then the penalty was imposed. It is difficult to appreciate much less accept the contention of the delinquent employee that he was not given a fair opportunity to defend himself, that there was undue haste in conducting the enquiry and that principles of natural justice were violated. To me it appears that there was a fair, proper and legal enquiry and he has

admitted the allegation made against him and which allegation amounted to misconduct. The punishment that have been awarded to him cannot be questioned on that ground.

11. It is now contended that the enquiry was not initiated by a Competent Authority. It was the Deputy Director, Ground Services, who appointed the Enquiry Committee after giving him a chargesheet and calling upon him to explain. Shri Shetgiri, Asst. Administrative Officer Ground Services Department, NIPTC was the Enquiry Officer. The delinquent employee was a Loader, he was appointed by an order signed by Personnel Officer, Recruitment and Development of Air India. It was communicated to him to the Controller, Ground Handling Department. The Deputy Director had initiated the enquiry. I do not see how it could be urged that initiation of that enquiry was not proper and legal. Assuming for a moment that it was not shown even then the action taken against him cannot be said to have been vitiated. Initiation by an Authority lower than appointing Authority is held to be legal and all that is necessary is that the dismissal or removal cannot be by an Authority subordinate to appointing Authority. This is a view taken by the Supreme Court of India in Transport Commissioner, Madras, Petitioner Vs. A.R.K. Moorthy, Respondent, 1995 1 CLR 377. In yet another decision of the High Court of Bombay in the case, Dayashankar Singh, Petitioner, Vs. Union of India and Ors., Respondents reported in 1992 11 CLR 107, the High Court held that the appointment of petitioners was by Assistant Security Officers and the order of removal was passed by Senior Security Officer who was superior in rank to the Asst. Security Officer and therefore valid. In substance, appointment of an Enquiry Officer by a person lower in rank than the appointing authority or the authority competent to remove will not in any event affect the ultimate disciplinary action taken. All that is necessary is that the action of the authority must be taken by a Competent Authority and it should be preceded by a domestic enquiry which should be fair and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. In my opinion, that has been done in this case and no fault could be found with the same. I must also mention, because it has been so urged, that this is for the first time that the delinquent employee is raising this contention and he never said anything about it during the entire enquiry proceedings and even thereafter, when he was given an opportunity to show cause why penalty should not be inflicted and even after inflicting the penalty when he chose to prefer an appeal against that action.

12. I also find that there is no merit in the contention that it was necessary that the Senior Deputy Controller, Ground Handling to direct an enquiry and that Deputy Controller in Ground Handling could not have done so. The relevant regulations have been referred to and more particularly reference to schedule-I Disciplinary and Appellate Authority is made. So far as the Ground Handling Department is concerned it is seen that the Controller, Ground Handling is Competent Authority so far as employees not above the grade of Asst. Engineering Manager or its equivalent. So far as Senior Deputy Controller, Ground Handling is concerned it also speaks of an employee not above the grade of Clerk or its equivalent. I therefore, find that it would not be correct to say that the Deputy Director was incompetent to initiate the departmental proceedings.

13. There is only one more point that remains to be considered and that is with regard to penalty imposed. It has been submitted that it is shockingly disproportionate Penalty has to be commensurate with the gravity of the charge. It is true that while imposing penalty the past conduct has to be taken note of and in this particular case I find that the delinquent employee's misconduct consisted of remaining absent without permission for a period of 93 days. It is also noted by the Disciplinary Authority that he was in the habit of remaining absent without permission and on the earlier occasion had to be dealt with departmentally for his absence for 74 days. That was during December 1981 to September 1982. When charged with this misconduct he accepted the allegations and prayed for pardon. On his assurance that he would not misbehave a lenient view was taken and punishment of reduction by two stages in the time scale of pay for a period of one year effective 1-1-1983 was given. This had no salutary effect

on him and he again remained absent for 93 days during December 1982 and December 1983. It is with this background that the Disciplinary Authority thought and that too after giving him an opportunity to show cause that penalty of removal from service was called for and imposed the same. In my view it cannot be said that it is disproportionate to the gravity of misconduct more particularly in view of his past record much less can it be said that it is shockingly disproportionate requiring intervention in this reference.

14. I therefore, find that the action of the management in terminating the service of Shri Pande is legal and justified and he is not entitled to any relief.

Award accordingly.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1995

कांआ० 1257—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार माऊथ सेंट्रल रेलवे के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के सबद्ध दियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण बम्बई नं. 2 के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-41012/13/90-आईआर(डीयू)]

पी. जे. माईकल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

S.O. 1257.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay No. 2 as shown in the Annexure, industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of South Central Railway, Secunderabad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-4-1995.

[No. L-41012/13/90-IR (DU)]

P. J. MICAEL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/32 of 1990

Employers in relation to the management of South Central Railway, Secunderabad,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Mr. M. S. M. Shastri, Representative.

For the Workmen—Mr. L. R. Shrivalkar, Representative.
Bombay, the 16th March, 1995

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by its letter No. L-41012/13/90-IR (DU) dated 19-10-90 has referred to the following industrial dispute for adjudication in the terms mentioned below :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of South Central Railway through the General Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad, Andhra

Pradesh in terminating the services of Shri Edwin Gomes, Asstt. Station Master, Sanvordem Railway Station w.e.f. 10-6-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

2. Shri Edwin Gomes was appointed to the Railway service by the General Manager, West of India Portuguese Guaranteed Railway Co. Ltd., Marmugao Harbour as Telegraph Trainee on 1-11-1957. Later on he was promoted as the Asstt. Station Master. In 1961 the West of India Portuguese Railway portion was taken over by Indian Government and the Staff was absorbed. The Applicant obtained a NO OBJECTION certificate dated 25-11-77 from the General Manager, Secunderabad to go abroad. He was transferred to Sanvordem station. He applied for 30 days leave from 5-7-79 to 4-8-79 and it was sanctioned. On 4-7-79 he sent a letter to Divisional Personnel Officer/Hubli praying for 36 months leave which was not replied. On 25-7-79 he communicated to the Divisional Personnel Officer his intention to absent on 36 months leave and to go abroad. He gave the necessary address of abroad as Edwin Gomes C/o Mrs. A. D. Fernandes, P.O. Box 9008, Ahmadi Kuwait. The workman did not receive any letter from the Opponent railway at that address at any time.

3. On 19-7-82 the applicant reported for duty at Sanvordem station but he was not allowed to take the charge. He came to know that he was terminated from the services. He made correspondence with the Hubli Office and made appeals to different authorities but he was not replied to. Ultimately he approached the Railway Ministry through the Goa M.P. Shri Eduardo Felcio and for the first time the Applicant got a written information that he was removed from the service. He also got the copies of the disciplinary proceedings and the removal order on 3-3-89. He preferred a representation against these orders on 30-3-89 but failed to get consideration.

4. The Applicant contended that the action of the management Railway of terminating him from services being absent is without any justification and is against the Rule 2014-II. He contended that his removal is against the principles of natural justice. He was not given reasonable opportunity to defend himself.

5. The Applicant contended that he may be reinstated in service with full back wages w.e.f. 19-7-82 when he reported to the duty at the Sanvordem station with other reliefs.

6. The Railway administration, employer by its written statement (Exh. 4) resisted the claim. It is contended that the workman initially obtained leave for 30 days and later on the workman was absent from duty without any sanction. As per the procedure the departmental enquiry was initiated against him and the action for removal was suggested. It was accepted by the General Manager after giving the report and ultimately he was removed from the service. It is asserted that while taking action against him the management tried to serve the chargesheet to the last known address but all the correspondence came back with an endorsement left and gone abroad. It is denied that the workman applied for 36 months leave and got it sanctioned. It is also denied that he sent his address of abroad to the employer before leaving or at any later date. It is contended that there is no justification in the claim of the workman and it deserves to be dismissed.

7. My Learned Predecessor framed issues at Exh. 6. The issues and my findings thereon are as below :

ISSUES

FINDINGS

- Whether the workman had informed the Railway Management about his foreign address, and the Railway Management had received it? In the negative
- Whether a Railway Servant cannot be removed from Service unless he remains absent from duty for a continuous period of five years? In the negative
- Whether the action of the management of South Central Railway through the General Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad, Andhra Pradesh in terminating the services of Shri Edwin Gomes, is justified. The action is justified.

Asst. Station Master, Sanvordem Railway Station with effect from 10-6-1982 is justified?

- If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled? Does not survive
- What Award? As per the order below

REASONS

8. On 25-2-90 the representative of the workman informed the Tribunal that no oral evidence is to be lead on behalf of the workman. Later on one Shri K. Venkateswarulu, Senior Divisional Personnel Officer of the South Central Railway, Hubli filed his affidavit (Exh. 8) on behalf of the railways. It is pertinent to note that his affidavit has an endorsement from the representative of the workman that he does not want to cross-examine the witness. In the other words what is affirmed by Shri Venkateswarulu has to be accepted to be correct one unless the same is proved by the other evidence.

9. Shri K. Venkateswarulu affirmed that the workman Gomes, Asstt. Station Master of Sanvordem station was granted no objection certificate to visit Kuwait during the year 1977. He took 31 days leave from 5-7-79 to 3-8-79. But he failed to join the duties after the expiry period of leave on 5-7-79. He remained absent unauthorisedly for a period of 3 years from 5-8-79. He did not get his leave sanctioned nor did he follow the Railway medical attendance rules. A chargesheet was sent to his last known address but was returned as undelivered. Then the Disciplinary Authority nominated the Traffic Inspector as the Enquiry Officer to enquire into the charges levelled against the workman. The Enquiry Officer fixed a date of hearing as 22-2-81. An advise was sent to his last known address under acknowledgement due. It came back with an endorsement that not found returned back to the sender. Again a second chargesheet was given to the workman to attend the enquiry on 30-4-81 by registered post, acknowledgement due. It came back with the postal authorities endorsement "ADDRESSEE OUT OF STATION WITHOUT LEAVING ADDRESS". It is asserted that the Enquiry Officer, exhibited all the charges against the workman and then conducted the enquiry ex parte on 30-11-81 with the available documents and the witnesses. He found the workman guilty of the charges framed against him. After the enquiry papers were sent to the General Manager the appointing authority of the workman. He proposed the publication of removal. He was removed from the service w.e.f. 10-6-82 vide penalty advise No. P(T) 227/EG/UBL dated 10-6-82. A copy of the said advise was sent to him by post to his last known address came back with an endorsement partly left for abroad and returned the same to the sender. In that advise the workman was asked to prefer an appeal if he chooses. The workman happened to file an appeal on 15-2-84. The Railway Board considered the appeal and observed that the penalty of removal from service imposed upon the workman Gomes is justified for the serious lapse of unauthorised absence which is proved by evidence and it rejected the appeal. The decision of the Railway Board was communicated to the workman on 9-5-1985. Then he made a representation to the Assistant Labour Commissioner on 31-12-88. The Commissioner was also informed regarding the whole history.

10. From the written arguments which is filed on behalf of the representative of the workman, nothing is to be seen by which it can be said that the action of the management while taking action against him was illegal. It also could not be found out that the enquiry which was held against the workman was against the principles of natural justice. It appears that as he was not in India and left for abroad and, he was not served with the letters. How the burden is on the workman to prove that while leaving for abroad he had sent his address to the management. In the statement of claim by annexure A/3 it is tried to submit that he gave the Kuwait address while leaving the place. Venkateswarulu affirmed that the employer was not aware of the address of the workman in Kuwait. He failed to get the Administration informed about his whereabouts ever after he went abroad. He affirmed that the workman left

the place without getting his leave sanctioned. These acts clearly go to show that the workman is irresponsible. Nothing is shown by him how the enquiry which was held against him can be stated to be against principles of natural justice. It is to be said that the enquiry is as per the rules.

11. The workman placed reliance on rule 2014 heavily. It reads as under :

1. No Railway Servant shall be granted leave of any kind for a continuous period exceeding five years.
2. Where a Railway Servant does not resume duty after remaining on leave for a continuous period of five years or where a Railway servant after the expiry of his leave remains absent from duty, otherwise than on foreign service or on account of suspension, for any period which together with the period of leave granted to him exceeds five years he shall, unless the president, in view of the exceptional circumstances of the case, otherwise determines, be deemed to have resigned and shall accordingly cease to be in Railway Service.

After going through the rule it cannot be said that the Railway Servant cannot be removed from services unless he remains absent from duty for a continuous period of five years. The representation which is made by the workman on that rule is absolutely incorrect. What this rule suggests regarding unsanctioning of leave for a continuous period exceeding five years. It provides sanction of leave for more than five years in exceptional circumstances only by the President of India. There is no evidence for coming to the conclusion that the enquiry which was held against the workman is against the principles of natural justice. The workman had not lead any evidence except production of documents which was denied to have received by the management referring to his foreign address. Under such circumstances, the action of the management for removal of the workman is justified. I return my findings on the points accordingly and pass the following order :

ORDER

1. The action of the management of South Central Railway through the General Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad, Andhra Pradesh in terminating the services of Shri Edwin Gomes, Asstt. Station Master, Sanvordem Railway Station w.e.f. 10-6-1982 is justified.
2. No order as to costs.

Dated : 16-3-1995

S. B. PANSSE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1258.--औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1917 (1947 का 14) को धारा 17 के अनुसूचना में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूनिट ट्रस्ट ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सभ्य नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, 1 तमबई के पचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/318/91/आई.आर. (बी. 2)]

वी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

S.O. 1258.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, I, Bombay as

shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Unit Trust of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-4-95.

[No. L-12012/318/91-IR(B-II)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

Present :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-21 OF 1992

Employers in relation to the management of Unit Trust of India

AND

Their Workmen

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-24 OF 1992

Employers in relation to the management of Unit Trust of India

AND

Their Workmen

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-25 OF 1992

Employers in relation to the management of Unit Trust of India

AND

Their Workmen

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-26 OF 1992

Employers in relation to the management of Unit Trust of India

AND

Their Workmen

Appearances :

For the Management : Shri D. D. Naik, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri G. B. Chavan, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Unit Trust STATE : Maharashtra
Bombay, dated the 29th day of March, 1995

AWARD

All these references are pending for adjudication before this Tribunal.

2. Government of India by letter dated 27-3-1992 referred dispute mentioned in the schedules for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Parties have filed their statements of claim and written statement.

3. However today the Learned Advocates appearing on either side and the concerned workmen and P. B. Vijayraghavan Manager on behalf of Unit Trust of India appeared and submitted that they have arrived at a settlement and that there is no need for adjudication. The workmen concerned have also ad-

mitted before me that the settlement has been reached and it was acceptable to them. In view of this position I think it is not necessary to proceed further in the matter and since the payment has been already made by the Unit Trust of India to the concerned workmen and which fact has been admitted before me no further orders are necessary. No dispute Award. Disposed of.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली: 10 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1259 -- औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 11) का धारा 17 के अनुसूच में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-1 बम्बई के पंचपट का प्रकाशन कर्ता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[मं. एल-12012/348/93-आई.आर. (बी.-2)]

वी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

S.O. 1259.--In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, 1 Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-4-95.

[No. L-12012/348/93-IR(B-II)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

Present :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-21 OF 1994

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of
Bank of India, Nerul

AND

Their Workmen

Appearances :

For the Management : Mr. Kerkar.

For the Workman : Shri Subhash Naik Gorge.

INDUSTRY : Banking STATE : Goa

Goa, the 23rd day of March, 1995

AWARD

Government of India Ministry of Labour has by letter dt. 11th of March, 1994 referred for adjudi-

cation under section 10(1)(d) read with 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 dispute mentioned in the schedule below.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of India, Nerul in dismissing Shri Pradeep Krishna Sawant, Staff Subordinate Sepoy from service with effect from 29-8-1992 is justified? If not, to what relief, is the said workman entitled to?"

2. Statement of claim and written statement here-to have been filed.

3. Undisputed position is that the delinquent workman, Shri Savant come to be appointed on the establishment of Bank of India as a sub-staff in May 1981. On 28th of June he was served with a charge-sheet alleging that he misappropriated the money entrusted to him by a customer of the Bank, made false entries in the pass book of the customer and also took Rs. 2000/- from the joint S. B. Account No. 1362 of Smt. D'Mello for making fixed deposit receipt and when, she stated making inquiries about the fixed deposit receipt he redeposited the said amount in her account on 10th of June, 1991.

4. On the same day inquiry was directed Inquiry Officer was appointed and the delinquent employee was asked to present himself before the Inquiry Officer. He was informed that he was at liberty to submit an explanation in writing in answer to the charges levelled against him and mentioned in the charge-sheet, produce witnesses and other documentary evidence in his defence cross-examine any witness and other documentary evidence produced in support of charges and also permitted to bring with him for his defence a representative of the registered Trade Union of Bank employees of which he was a member on the date first informed for the commencement of the inquiry. He was also told that if he was not a member of any trade Union of the Bank employees a representative of the Registered Trade Union of employees of the Bank in which he was employed was permitted.

5. The proceedings were held by the inquiry Officer and Annexure 'D' shows that delinquent employee appeared before the Officer and he was informed by the inquiry officer about his appointment by the disciplinary authority. He was also informed about the appointment of Mr. Sangamkar as a Presiding Officer.

6. Shri Sangamkar presented a copy of the charge-sheet served on the Shri Savant the delinquent employee and the chargesheet was read over. The delinquent employee had confirmed that he had understood the chargesheet and that he had received the copy of the same translated in a vernacular language.

7. Thereafter he was asked whether he admitted the charges mentioned in the chargesheet and whether he had brought any defence representative. Mr. Savant the delinquent informed that Shri Utagi President of the Staff Union of which he was a member to act as a defence representative.

8. When once again asked whether he admitted all the charges listed in the said chargesheet Shri Savant stated that he admitted all the charges mentioned in the chargesheet dt. 20-6-92 voluntarily and pleaded guilty.

9. The presenting Officer thereafter presented certain documents in original alongwith a list and list of witnesses also. They were taken on record and copies supplied to the delinquent employee. A further statement was recorded and therefrom it is seen that he has admitted the allegations and all that he did was to plead for mercy on the ground urged by him. He made it clear to the inquiry officer that he had been in financial difficulties and therefore committed the mistake which he very much regretted. He added that he was confirming all the charges voluntarily and unconditionally with his free will and without any promise of favour. He pleaded for a fresh lease of life to enable him to rehabilitate himself and support his family assuring that he will not commit such mistake. He signed alongwith his representative on the proceedings and so did the presenting Officer and the inquiry Officer.

10. Thereafter he was given a show cause notice on 6th of August 1992 calling upon him to show cause why penalty of dismissal from Bank's service without notice be not imposed upon him for having committed a major misconduct contemplated by clause 19.5 (j) of the Bipartite Settlement dt. 19-10-1966 a personal hearing was given to him and thereafter the disciplinary authority concurring with the findings of the inquiry Officer imposed the proposed penalty. An appeal against this order did not succeed and therefore matter was taken up in conciliation resulting in present order of reference for adjudication. I have heard Mr. Naik President of the Goa Bank Employees Association and Mr. Kerkar on behalf of the Bank.

11. Mr. Naik has raised 3 points for consideration. His first submission is that there has been a violation of the provisions of the Bipartite Agreement of 1966. Relevant provision pointed out is 19.12 in chapter (xix). His submission is that this is a case of a dismissal and inquiry could not have been dispensed with, as has been done by the management and the inquiry Officer. In such a case he referred to clause (e) 19.12 which categorises the cases in which inquiry need not be held. According to him once the management intended to award a punishment of discharge or dismissal it was obligatory upon the management to hold an inquiry and his argument that inquiry means recording of evidence subjecting them to cross-examination and thereafter recording findings for or against the delinquent. He says that a voluntary admission of the delinquent employee even in such a case could not dispense with this type of inquiry. I am unable to accept this submission made on behalf of the delinquent workman. I have already narrated the events that took place from the submissions of the chargesheet till the order of dismissal passed and confirmed in appeal. It is not necessary to repeat all that over again. Suffice it to say that if the delinquent employee admits the allegations made in the chargesheet and if it is found that there is no need for recording evidence then it is not necessary nor obligatory upon the inquiry officer

to record that evidence. In my view that would be an exercise in futility.

12. What is in fact contemplated by clause (e) is dispensing with the inquiry itself and Mr. Kerkar on behalf of the Bank submitted that he was not relying upon that clause for submitting that that justified dispensing with the inquiry. He says that an inquiry was necessary, inquiry was held and based on the report of the inquiry officer penalty has been imposed. According to him therefore the order of dismissal is preceded by an inquiry and there is no violation whatsoever of the provisions of Bipartite Settlement clause 19.12. I find that there is considerable force in this aspect of the argument advanced on behalf of the Bank. On reading 19.12 (a) I find that when an employee against whom disciplinary action is proposed or likely to be taken the employee shall be given a chargesheet clearly stating forth the circumstances against him and that the management has done and Mr. Naik fairly submitted that he had no grievance about that. Then a date has to be fixed for the inquiry and sufficient time has to be given to the delinquent employee to prepare himself and give his explanation and also to produce evidence that he may wish to tender in his defence. That has been done and such notice has been given to him. Then he has to be permitted to appear before the inquiry officer to cross-examine witnesses on whose evidence the charge rests and to examine witnesses and produce other evidence in his defence. If the occasion had arisen I am sure he would have been permitted to do that but because of his admission and plea which was acceptable as it was voluntary this contingency did not arise. He was also permitted to be represented by a representative and that opportunity he availed of by appointing Mr. Utagi as a defence representative. He has to be given a hearing before the proposed punishment is imposed in case the charges were established. That has also been done by the disciplinary authority and he was supplied with a copy of the report of the inquiry officer. After giving him an opportunity of personal hearing during the course of which he made oral as well as written submission the management namely the disciplinary authority imposed the penalty. In my view this is a type of inquiry that is contemplated that should have been held and that has been held. In view of the fact that there was an admission, there was a plea of the delinquent employee there was no need for examination of any witness or producing any documents to prove the charges levelled against him. What is required to be proved is what is not admitted. In a domestic inquiry this is in my view all that is expected. All that is necessary is that that inquiry must be fair, in accordance with the principles of natural justice rules in the form of Bipartite Settlements and I must say without hesitation that this has been all complied with. In my view therefore the first point what has been raised on behalf of delinquent by Mr. Naik does not appeal to me.

13. He then submits that the past record has not been considered. According to him this was the first chargesheet supplied to him during the course of his service of over 10 years. Therefore this was a lapse on the part of the management. There are 3 aspects which have to be taken note of by the disciplinary authority and one is gravity of the charge levelled

against him. If that charge is grave enough then probably aggravating factors are not required to be looked into. I would also say that if the charge is grave enough to warrant a penalty of dismissal by itself extenuating circumstances would relegate to the background.

14. He then submitted that the penalty imposed is harsh and also relied upon a decision of the Supreme Court reported in 1982 (1) LLJ Page 472 in the case between Ramakant Mishra and the State of U.P. and others. That is a case in which Supreme Court examined the width of power of the Tribunal under section 11A newly introduced. It is not disputed that this Tribunal has the power to scale down the penalty found to be harsh and unjustified. The point is not about the existence of a power but about the exercise of the power in a given case. On behalf of the management it was submitted that this certainly was not a fit case wherein the penalty imposed could be reduced and diluted. Submission made is that the confidence reposed in this delinquent employee both by the friend and by the Bank has been abused. He did not stop short of misappropriating, though temporarily, the funds. He made alterations in the Bank pass book and that was a far more serious charge coupled with the charge of misappropriation. It is true that Mr. Naik on behalf of the workman urged that he should be given a chance to improve himself and be not deprived of his only source of income of earning bread for family depending upon him. He also submitted that in a similar case Labour Court No. 2, Presiding Officer of Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Bombay reduced the penalty and substituted it by reinstatement without backwages. I wish I could share the views of my learned brother on the point. However I am of the view that the punishment that is to be imposed for a major misconduct like this should only be proportionate to the gravity of the charges and in this case the charge is grave enough. It should also act as deterrent for others similarly placed and I still feel that it would be a case of misplaced sympathy if at the end of all this exercise an employee gets away with a feeling that all that happens even after he was proved to be guilty of a major misconduct was loss of wages for the intervening period. Mr. Naik did his best to convince me that not only loss of wages but he may be imposed all other penalties that are contemplated by the Bipartite Agreement. I regret my inability to accept this submission also. However before parting with the case I must mention that Mr. Naik has been fair in making his submissions and I also had an equally fair assistance from Mr. Kerkar on behalf of the Bank. In the end I find that the action of the management is justified and that the workman is not entitled to any relief.

Award accordingly.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1995

का.आ. 1260.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1917 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ महाराष्ट्र के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अन्वय में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-1 बम्बई के पंचपट

को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[गं. एन-12011/74/89-डी II ए/आई.आर.बी.2]
वी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1995

S.O. 1260.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-I, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Maharashtra and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-4-95.

[No. L-12011/74/89-D II A/IR(B-II)]
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.
Reference No. CGIT-40 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bank of Maharashtra.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management.—Shri Nayak, Officer.

For the Workmen.—No appearance.

INDUSTRY : Banking STATE : Maharashtra
Bombay, the 27th March, 1995

AWARD

Government of India, Ministry of Labour has referred dispute mentioned in the schedule below for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of Maharashtra in relation to its Tilak Road Branch in not making the payment of overtime wages to 14 workmen whose list is enclosed as Annexure ‘A’ alongwith the hours of overtime worked for the period from 1-5-1988 to 31-12-1988 in the Tilak Road Branch, Pune is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled for?”

2. Statement of claim has been filed on behalf of the Bank of Maharashtra Karmachari Sangh by its General Secretary. The contention of the Sangh is that the employees mentioned in the list annexed to the reference have put in overtime work and though entitled to overtime wages have not been paid overtime wages. Demand made was not acceded to and that has led to this reference.

3. According to Sangh the hours of work for subordinate staff and for clerical staff have been fixed by the Bipartite Settlement and overtime payment has been also prescribed by the said Settlement if the staff worked beyond the hours fixed. It is its case that for the period 1-5-1988 to 31-12-1988 the staff doing the overtime work marked in the Register maintained at Tilak Road Branch in Form-J prescribed under the Maharashtra Shops and Establishment Act. As per the practice prevailing they have to be paid overtime wages on or before the 7th of the succeeding calendar month and not only that they were not so paid on or before the 7th of the succeeding month but never paid.

4. The claim is resisted by the management of the Bank by raising several contentions. In the first instance, the fact that they put in overtime work as alleged is denied. It is further denied that it is necessary for claiming overtime wages that the management should have asked them to do overtime work. If they are not required to do overtime work then they are not entitled to overtime wages only on the ground that they were in the office beyond the scheduled hours of work. They are keeping quiet when they were not paid by the due dates in the succeeding months is indicative of the fact, contends the management, that they knew that they were not entitled. It is also contended that they have not filled in the Overtime Card and sanction has not been obtained as required. Reliance is placed also by the management on the Bipartite Settlement to substantiate their contentions. It is denied that Shops and Establishment Act applied and even if it applied it contends there are exemptions provided. It is further contended that they are not entitled to any overtime wages because they have not established that they were asked to do overtime work and also not established that they have put in overtime work.

5. Rejoinder has been filed by the Sangh repudiating the averments made in the written statement.

6. Written arguments have been submitted on behalf of the management. Unfortunately there was no appearance on behalf of the Sangh, on both dates namely, 29-7-1994 and 26-9-1994 when the matter was posted for hearing.

7. The point is whether they are entitled to overtime wages on the basis of overtime work put in by them. Management's case is that they have not shown that they have put in overtime work. Besides, it is the management's contention that what is necessary is that they should have been asked to do overtime work and if it is not shown that they have been asked to do they would not be entitled to any overtime wages. It is argued that there is no material to show that they have been asked to do overtime work. In this connection reference has been made to Bipartite Settlement which is obviously binding on the parties. The relevant clause of the Bipartite Settlement is 14.6 which says that the Bank can require a workman, without his consent, to work beyond the aforesaid hours of work prescribed for him (called overtime work for the purposes of this Settlement). It is further subject to the maximum of 175 hours in a calendar

year. Then Clause 14.10 provides that for the first one-quarter of an hour of overtime work on any working day, there shall be no payment for the workmen other than members of the subordinate staff. It then states that if the overtime work extends beyond the cushioning period overtime payment shall be made for the whole period of overtime work including the cushioning period. On the basis of this provision, submission on behalf of the management made is that it is this clause that entitles the workmen overtime payment and read with Clause 14.6 it will be obvious that it is necessary that the Bank should 'require' the workman to work beyond the aforesaid hours of the work prescribed for him and it is such period which is called overtime work for the purpose of the Settlement which in turn provides by Clause 14.10 overtime payment. It is for this purpose, the Bank contends, that the employees had to fill in Overtime Card which provided for the signature of the Departmental Incharge and also provided for necessary column mentioning overtime hours slab and overtime payment calculations. They have produced xerox copies of such Cards alongwith the list dated 21-5-1993. It has to be noted that this practice of non-filling the Overtime Cards by some employees was not approved by the Branch Manager of Tilak Road Branch by order dated August 30, 1989. It is seen from letter dated 20th July, 1988 that the Unit Secretary of the Sangh does not make out a case that these employees at Tilak Road Branch were required by the management to sit late beyond the normal working hours. It says in the first para that due to administrative and business exigencies employees are required to sit late beyond their normal working hours. It is, therefore, clear that even the Sangh does not make out a case that they were directed by the management to sit late beyond scheduled hours.

8. The grievance of the Sangh is that it is not necessary to fill in the Overtime Card and payment of overtime wages cannot be made dependant upon that. It is submitted that the Bank maintains Register in Form-J and that mentions the hours of work and from that overtime put in could be ascertained. What could be seen from those Registers is the time they spent in the Office. It will not show that they were required by the Bank to put in overtime work and that too for the reasons contemplated. Besides, it is seen from the Overtime Card that the signature of the Departmental Incharge is required to be obtained and that could be obtained only if he is satisfied that the Bank required overtime attendance. It is submitted on behalf of the Bank that these very employees whose cause is espoused by the Sangh have prior to and subsequent to this period for which overtime is claimed filled in such Overtime Cards and had obtained signatures of the Departmental Incharge in the relevant column. They are to be found as annexures L-1 to L-10 with list dated 21-6-1993. The Sangh had by letter dated 1-9-1989 called upon the Bank to quote the relevant abstract of the Act, Award and Settlement applicable to the staff showing that overtime wages will not be paid unless the Overtime Cards were submitted. By this letter it informed the Branch Manager that the members of the Sangh are not bound by any Office Order. It is rather difficult to accept the contention

of the Sangh that merely by reason of the fact that they continued in the Office beyond the prescribed hours they become entitled to overtime wages. In my opinion, it is the requirement of the Bank that is necessary. If the employees chose to sit beyond the Office hours as appears to be the case here and yet claim overtime wages, I do not think such a demand could be held justified.

9. It is the contention of the Sangh that provisions of Shops and Establishments Act would enable them to claim overtime wages for sitting beyond scheduled hours of work. I do not find any such provision nor it has been pointed out to me. The management has contended that the said provisions are not applicable as they have been exempted for the operation of those provisions. The Sangh contends that the Awards, Settlement and Agreements had to yield place to the provisions of the Act. Leaving aside this contravrsy I find that, that Act also does not say that they would be automatically entitled overtime wages if they happen to be on the Bank premises. The Bank it has been stated should not be opened earlier than 7.30 a.m. and closed later than 9.00 p.m. It then states that "No employee should be required or allowed to work for more than 4 hours before he has had rest interval of at least half-an-hour". It therefore, speaks of an employee being required or allowed to work. It then speaks about the weekly holiday and about female employees. It then speaks about the Registers about records maintained by the Bank immediately before this exception and directs that they should be properly maintained by the Banks in respect of all their employees. I therefore, do not see how Sangh can on the basis of provisions of this Act contend that they are entitled overtime wages merely because they worked beyond the prescribed hours. The relevant provision has to be found under section 63 which speaks of wages for overtime work. It says "where an employee in any establishment to which this Act applies is required to work in excess of the limit of hours of work, he shall be entitled, in respect of the overtime work, wages at the rate of twice his ordinary rate of wages." Therefore, this provision also speaks of a case where he is 'required' to work in excess of the limit of hours of work. Obviously the management must require him to work and then the limits are prescribed by the schedule.

10. Considered in the light of these provisions, I find that the employees would not be entitled to any overtime wages unless it is shown that they were required to put in overtime. This requirement is to be found by the management. Management has produced Registers and one of them is a Time Muster maintained at Tilak Road Branch for the period 1-5-1983 to 31-12-1988. That is filled in by employees. This again does not show that they were required by the management to do overtime work. It has to be noted that the overtime wages were payable on or before 7th of the succeeding months. Though they were not paid overtime wages for a period of 6 months they made a claim for overtime wages by letter dated 20th July, 1988 mentioned that Time Muster is being maintained with effect from 1-5-1988. The management submits that it is because they were aware that they were not entitled to overtime wages that they did not ask for the same. I am not, however, attaching much importance to this submission. In fact, in

April, a letter has been addressed by Unit Secretary to the Branch Manager about maintenance of Time Register. Two other letters are produced in which the employees stated that they have put in overtime work and there was no Time Register and therefore, they were informing by letters. They are dated 19-4-1988 and 27-4-1988. However, I have stated above that it is not for the employees to claim overtime wages unless it is shown that the management required them to put in overtime work. It is a part of the argument of the management that the employees may choose to while away their time and chose to do that work they were expected to do during the scheduled working hours late and claim benefits of overtime wages. This is, according to the management impermissible. An order issued in this behalf is produced on record. There General Manager invited the attention of the staff to this practice of taking overtime wages without there being any justification for the same. That is Exh M-2 dated 31st December 1976, it says that overtime will not result without the express permission of the Agent/Officer-in-Charge/Departmental Heads. Exh. M-1 dated 27th October 1972 also deals with the entries in Overtime Cards being made in support of the claim for that time. Once again in 1989 by Office Order need for filling up Overtime Cards for claiming overtime wages was insisted upon. I therefore, find that the action of the management in not making payment of Overtime wages cannot be said to be unjustified and the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

Award accordingly.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 अप्रैल, 1995

का. आ. 1261.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओरियेन्टल इन्शुरेन्स कं. लि. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अहमदाबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-4-95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल--17012/16/92/आई. आर. बी.-2]

बी. के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th April, 1995

S.O. 1261.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-4-95.

[No. L-17012/16/92-IR(B-II)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI H. D. PANDYA, PRESIDING
OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 17 of 1992.

ADJUDICATION

BETWEEN :

Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd., Ahmedabad

AND

The workmen employed under it.

In the matter of termination of services of Shri V.C.
Hannad w.e.f. 31-7-1991.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd., Ahmedabad and the workmen employed under it had been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to the Industrial Tribunal consisting of Shri B. M. Bhatt and subsequently transferred to me by appropriate Government Order.

2. This matter was adjourned from time to time to enable the workman to lead evidence. However, the workman did not remain present. Finally, the matter was fixed today but the workmen or either of them was not present when called out. Hence, the reference is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Ahmedabad.

H. D. PANDYA, Presiding Officer.

Dated, 30th March, 1995.

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 1995

का. घा. 1262.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मद्रास के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10/4/95 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-30012/5/91—आई आर (विविध)/आई आर (कोल-1)]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1995

S.O. 1262.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Indian Oil Corporation, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-4-91.

[No. L-30012/5/91-IR(MISC)] [IR(Col.D)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

P35 GI/95-6.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL
NADU, MADRAS

Friday, the 20th day of January, 1995

PRESENT :

Thiru K. Ponnusamy, M.A. B.L.,

Industrial Tribunal.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 46/1991

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workman and the Management of Indian Oil Corporation, Madras].

BETWEEN

Shri K. Ramachandran,
No. 18th Lane, Anna Nagar,
Washermappet,
Madras-600081.

AND

They Dy. General Manager (P),
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
No. 139, Nungambakkam High Road,
Southern Region, Madras-34.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-30012/5/91-IR-Misc, dated 6-8-91,
Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New
Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiru K. M. Ramesh, Advocate appearing for the workman and of Tvl. T.S. Gopalan, S. Ravindran and N.C. Srinivasavaradhan, Advocates appearing for the Management, upon perusing the reference, Claim and Counter statements and other connected papers on record and the Counsel for the Management having filed a Memorandum of Settlement, and recording the same, this Tribunal passed the following :

AWARD

This reference has been made for adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the Management of Indian Oil Corporation is justified in terminating the services of Shri K. Raniachandran, Khalasi, with effect from 7-11-1989 on the ground of voluntary abandonment, of services ? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?"

Memo filed. Award is passed in terms of Settlement. No costs.

Dated, this the 20th day of January, 1995.

THIRU K. PONNUSAMY, Industrial Tribunal
COPY OF THE MEMO FILED ON BEHALF
OF THE RESPONDENT

K. Ramachandran

Petitioner.

vs.

Indian Oil Corporation

Respondent

MEMO FILED ON BEHALF OF THE
RESPONDENT

It is submitted that on 2-1-1995 both parties entered into a Settlement under Sec. 18(1) of the I.D. Act. The petitioner will be reinstated as Junior Operator without back wages. Copy of the Settlement is enclosed herewith.

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the above dispute as settled out of Court.

Dated, at Madras this the 20th day of January, 1995.

Sd/-

N. C. SRINIVASAVARDHAN,

Counsel for Petitioner.

Sd/-

Industrial Tribunal

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT UNDER
SECTION 18(1) OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES
ACT

PARTY TO THE DISPUTE :

Shri K. Ramachandran, Khalasi, EC No. 14707,
Lube Blending Plant.

REPRESENTING MANAGEMENT :

Shri R.N.J. Mathur, DGM (HR), IOCL, MDS.
REPRESENTING WORKMEN :

1. Shri R. M. Sundram, President, Indian Oil Employees Union.
2. Shri T. S. Rangarajan, General Secretary, Indian Oil Employees Union.
3. Shri S. Mohanraj, Treasurer, Indian Oil Employees Union.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE :

Shri K. Ramachandran, Ex-khalasi, Lube Blending Plant had left the services of the Corporation on Voluntary Abandonment grounds on 13-10-89 under clause 10(1) of Certified Standing Orders.

Shri K. Ramachandran has raised an Industrial Dispute under Section 2A of ID Act before the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C) Madras. The conciliation was held. As we have not accepted for reinstatement the employee, the conciliation officer has sent the failure report to the Ministry of Labour, Government of Tamil Nadu. The Ministry of Labour has referred the matter to Industrial Tribunal, Madras for adjudication. Now the matter is pending with the Industrial Tribunal as ID 46/91.

In the meantime, Indian Oil Employees Union has represented to the Management in writing to consider the Voluntary Abandonment cases for reinstatement

and the employee also has given a representation requesting the Appellate Authority to consider his request sympathetically for reinstatement in service as he was in severe financial distress.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT :

Union and the Management had several rounds of discussions on the subject and have agreed to the following terms and conditions.

1. Shri Ramachandran will be reinstated as Junior Operator (F) without back wages.
2. Shri Ramachandran will be given the benefit of continuity of service for the purpose of Superannuation Benefit Fund as per SBF rules and Gratuity only and the period from the date of voluntarily abandoned from the Corporation till he resumes duty as Jr. Operator (F) will be treated as LWP.
3. Shri Ramachandran will not claim any benefit or privilege by reason of continuity of service which is permissible only for gratuity and Superannuation Benefit Fund as per SBF rules.

The parties pray for an award in terms of this settlement.

Signed on the 2nd day of Jan, 1995 at Madras.

REPRESENTING MANAGEMENT :

Sd/-

(R. N. J. MATHUR)

REPRESENTING WORKMEN :

Sd/-

(S. MOHANRAJ)

Sd/-

(R. M. SUNDRAM)

Sd/-

(T.S. RANGARAJAN)

I have read the terms of this settlement which was explained to me in Tamil and I understood them. I agree to the above settlement.

Sd/-

(K. RAMACHANDRAN)

WITNESSES.

(1) Sd/- (Illegible)

Sd/-

Industrial Tribunal

(Tamil Nadu)

Madras

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 1995

का. धा. 1263.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमि. मद्रास के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निधोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-4-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल—30012/9/92—आई आर (निविदा)/
आई आर (कोल-I)]
ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1995

S.O. 1263.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Indian Oil Corporation, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-4-95.

[No. L-30012/9/92-IR(Misc.)/IR(Coal-I)]
BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
TAMIL NADU MADRAS

Thursday, the 19th day of January, 1995

PRESENT :

THIRU K. PONNUSAMY, M.A.B.L.,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
Industrial Dispute No. 82/1993

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workmen and the Management of Indian Oil Corporation, Madras).

BETWEEN

Sh. P. Vadivelu,
No. 1, Ganeshpuram, II Street,
Teynampet,
Madras-600018.

AND

The General Manager,
I.O.C. Ltd., 'Indian Oil Bhavan',
Nungambakkam, High Road
Madras-34

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-30012/9/92-IR(Misc.), dated 16-8-93,
Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Tvl. K. M. Ramesh, and Michael Amalraj, Advocates appearing for the workman, and of Tvl. T. S. Gopalan, and N. C. Srinivasavaradhan, Advocates appearing for the Management upon perusing the reference claim and Counter statements and all other material papers on record, and the Counsel for Management having filed a Memorandum of Settlement, and recording the same, this Tribunal passed the following.

AWARD

This reference has been made for adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the Management of Indian Oil Corporation, Madras is justified in terminating the services of Sh. P. Vadivelu, Sr. Watchman with effect from 12-10-1989 ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

Memo of Settlement filed. Award is passed in terms of settlement. No costs.

Dated, this the 19th day of January, 1995

THIRU K. PONNUSAMY, Industrial Tribunal
COPY OF MEMO FILED BY THE RESPONDENT
P. Vadivelu
—Petitioner

-Vs-

Indian Oil Corporation
—Respondent.

MEMO FILED BY THE RESPONDENT

It is submitted that both parties entered into a settlement under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act on 2-1-1995. Based on the above settlement the petitioner was reinstated as Security Guard without back wages, with continuity of service. A copy of the Settlement is enclosed herewith.

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the above dispute as Settled out of Court.

Dated, at Madras this the 19th day of January, 1995.

Sd/-

N. C. SRINIVASAVARADHAN, Counsel for
Petitioner.

COPY OF MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT
UNDER SECTION 18(1) OF INDUSTRIAL
DISPUTES ACT

Party to the Dispute	Shri P. Vadivelu, Watchman, EC No. 14 015, RO.
Representing Management	Shri R.N.J. Mathur, DGM (HR), IOCL, Madras
Representing Workmen	1. Shri R.M. Sundaram, President, Indian Oil Employees' Union 2. Shri T.S. Rangarajan, General Secretary, Indian Oil Employees Union, 3. Shri S. Mohanraj, Treasurer, Indian Oil Employees Union.

Short Recital of the Case :

Shri P. Vadivelu, Ex. Watchman, RO had voluntarily abandoned the services of the Corporation w.e.f. 23-5-89 under Clause 10(1) of Certified Standing Orders.

Shri P. Vadivelu, has raised an Industrial Dispute before the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras and the Conciliation failed. Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central) has sent the Failure Report to the Ministry of Labour. Now the dispute is pending before the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as I. D. No. 82/93.

In the meanwhile, Indian oil Employee Union has represented to the Management in writing to consider the Voluntary Abandonment Cases for reinstatement and the employee also has given a representation requesting the Appellate Authority to consider his request sympathetically for reinstatement in service considering his long association with the Corporation for 19 years and this being the first time he has voluntarily abandoned the services of the Corporation.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT :

Union and the Management had several rounds of discussions on the subject and have agreed to the following terms and conditions :

1. Shri P. Vadivelu will be reinstated as Security Guard without back wages.
2. P. Vadivelu will be given the benefit of continuity of service for the purpose of Gratuity, and Superannuation Benefit Fund as per SBC from the Corporation's Rules only and the period from the date of voluntary abandonment till he resumes duty as Security Guard will be treated as LWP.
3. Shri P. Vadivelu will not claim any benefit or privilege by reason of continuity of service which is permissible only for Gratuity and Superannuation Benefit Fund as per SBF Rules.

The Parties pray for an award in terms of this Settlement.

Signed on the 2nd day of Jan. 1995 at Madras.

REPRESENTING MANAGEMENT

Sd/- R. N. J. Mathur.

Sd/-(S. Mohanraj)

REPRESENTING WORKMEN

Sd/- R. M. Sundaram.

Sd/- T. S. Rangarajan.

I have read the terms of this settlement which was explained to me in Tamil and I understood them. I agree to the above settlement.

Sd/- P. Vadivelu.

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 1995

का. घा. 1264.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. की सेन्द्रा बंसजोरा कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, प्रबन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-I), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7/4/95 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

* [संख्या. एल-20012/329/89—घाई धार (कोल-I)]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1995

S.O. 1264.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. I), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sendra Bansjora Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-4-95.

[No. L-20012/329/89-IR(Coal-I)]
BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD
In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 92 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of
Sendra Bansjora Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.
Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri P. K. Singh, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri D. Mukherjet, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 29th March, 1995

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/329-I.R. (Coal-I) dated, the 18th April, 1990, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of Sendra Bansjora Colliery under Sijua Area of M/s. BCCL in dismissing Shri Basanta Bhuinya, S.F. Helper under dismissal letter dated 10-8-1988 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The sponsoring Union in its written statement has submitted that the workman had absented from duty on account of some mishap in his family but the local Union had informed the management about such mishap and had requested to grant leave to the concerned workman till he recovered from the shock and mental agony. After ward when the workman reported for duty he was not allowed to resume duty. Later a charge-sheet dated 20-3-87 was issued for the alleged misconduct of the workmen in absenting without authorisation. The workman denied the charge and explained the reasons for his absence. Even after that the management dismissed the workman from service though the domestic enquiry was held in violation of the principal of natural justice.

3. It has also been averred that the Union represented the case to the management against his dismissal but the management did not relent. Ultimately the industrial dispute so raised was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. A prayer has been made to order reinstatement of the workman with full back wages.

4. The management in its written statement has submitted that the workman, Basanta Bhuinya, S. F. Helper at Sendra Bansjora Colliery was on casual leave from 10-5-83 to 13-5-83. On 14-5-83 he took slip for joining the duty but did not join and absented thereafter continuously without authorisation. Ultimately chargesheet dated 20/21-3-97 was issued against him for the aforesaid misconduct. The workman in his reply admitted his guilt but took the defence that he had left the colliery on 14-5-83 on receipt of information of sudden death of his mother at home. He also explained thereafter that his wife also expired hence he had remained absent for unavoidable reasons.

5. Not finding the explanation to be satisfactory, the management ordered for a domestic enquiry which was held, claims the management, properly and fairly in which the Enquiry Officer found that the charge of misconduct had been proved. Thereafter the management dismissed the workman from

service. It has been argued that whatever sorrow or mental agony the workman had could not have lasted for four years altogether. Prayer has been made to uphold the action of the management.

6. It may be mentioned that it would appear from order dated 16-12-91, under the signature of my learned predecessor, that propriety and fairness of the domestic enquiry was taken up as preliminary issue but in course of argument on that point the authorised representative of the sponsoring Union conceded that the domestic enquiry was fair and proper. The learned predecessor also held the same. This way this matter has been heard on the basis of materials on the record, i.e., documents relating to the domestic enquiry.

7. The points for consideration are, firstly, as to whether or not the management by its evidence before the Enquiry Officer had proved the charge against the concerned workman and, if so, whether or not punishment inflicted upon the workman could be held to be just and proper.

8. Ext. M-1 is the chargesheet dated 20/21-3-87 in which it was alleged that the workman had taken casual leave from 10-5-83 to 13-5-83 and that the workman appeared to attend he duty on 14-5-83, obtained the slip for joining duty did not report for duty and absented himself.

9. Ex. M-2 is the reply of the concerned workman and in which he admitted that he had come to join duty on 14-5-83, but when after obtaining the slip for joining he was going towards the place of duty he received news that his mother had expired. He rushed to his home and found the information to be true. After some days his wife also expired. For these reasons he absented till 21-3-87. He also claimed that earlier also twice he had replied to the charge. He admitted his guilt that he had not given information to the management. He requested the management to allow him to resume his duty.

10. It also appears that the concerned workman had attended the domestic enquiry. On behalf of the management, its representative Sri R. N. Panda was the first to give statement before the Enquiry Officer stating that since 14-5-83 the workman was absenting without any information. The management also examined Sri Lal Chand Chamar, Attendance Clerk as well Bhuban Lal, Leave Clerk. Both supported that the workman had absented from 14-5-83 without any information. The workman refused to cross-examine these two witnesses.

11. Thereafter Basanta Bhuia was allowed to give his statement in which he reiterated his claim about receiving news of his mother's death while he was going to join duty on 14-5-83, at which he rushed to his home only to find the information to be correct. He further stated that after a few days his father also expired for which he had to stay at his home. He submitted that when he wanted to join duty after sometime his wife fell seriously ill and did not recover despite various treatments. Thereafter she also expired. Because of there she was entangled into family problems and could come to join duty only on 20-3-87. He admitted that he

did not send information to the management because he was so perplexed that he forgot to do so. He also submitted that he was a poor illiterate belonging to Bhuia caste and that his service was only source of bread for him. He apologised, and prayed for being allowed to join the duty. This is all the evidence on the record.

12. It will appear that the evidence of the management as well of the workman given before the Enquiry Officer have gone unchallenged because no cross-examination was done by either side. Therefore, it has to be assumed that the evidence given by all the witnesses were correct as there is nothing to show that those were not true. From management's side this means that the management has conclusively proved, also admitted by the workmen, that he had remained absent from duty right from 14-5-83 upto 20-3-87 on which day the workman had returned back to join his duty. It is also admitted that for his long absence he workman had neither given information to the management nor had obtained leave. Therefore it must be held that the management has been able to prove that the workman was guilty to the misconduct with which he was charged.

13. Now coming to the punishment, ordinarily the punishment for dismissal from service on account of such protracted absence without authorisation could be deemed to be just and proper. But in the instant case I feel that taking of a humanitarian view is also called for under the circumstances of the case. I already have mentioned that even the statement of the concerned workman has gone unchallenged. Therefore it must be taken that the management had not disputed the facts emerging out of the statement of the concerned workman given before the Enquiry Officer. This means that the workman, while proceeding to join on 14-5-83 had actually received the news of death of his mother at which he had rushed to his home and found the same to be true. It also follows that after sometime his father also expired. This also follows that after sometime his wife fell seriously ill and expired after sometime despite extensive medical treatment. The workman has claimed in his statement that such events engulfed him in family problems which resulted in the misconduct with which he was charged.

14. It is natural that a person suffering such three big losses one after another would not only undergo mental trauma but also would be faced with connected family problems. Though it may not justify absence for about four years, still the loss suffered by the workman within this period would cajole any authority also to take some humanitarian and lenient view at the time of awarding punishment. In such circumstances the loss of service which, according to the workman, was the only source of his income would only add to the problems of the concerned workman. This is why I find that though in ordinary circumstance the punishment of dismissal from service in fact of such misconduct would have justified the action of the management, but under peculiar circumstance of this case and in view of the losses

already suffered by the concerned workman, a humanitarian view laced with mercy in the punishment should be taken. It is in view of this that I find that the workman should not be dismissed from service but be allowed to be reinstated.

15. But punishment definitely is called for the misconduct proved against the workman. This workman, as per Ext. M-7, has been dismissed from service with immediate effect by an order issued on 10-8-88. The workman was absenting from 14-5-83 and had reported for The duty on 20-3-87. Definitely he must not have been paid wages from 14-5-93 upto date, a period of about 12 years. I feel that as a measure of punishment the workman on his reinstatement should not be allowed any back wages for this period.

16. I find that such an order is called for because even the management did not deem it fit to take any action against the concerned workman for about for long years and took the action only when the workman wanted to resume his duties.

17. Therefore, I find that though the management by evidence in the domestic enquiry has proved the misconduct alleged against the workman in the charge-sheet, but, taking a lenient view under the circumstances discussed above, the punishment of dismissal from service should be held to be excessive and the workman be ordered to be reinstated into service by the management within two months of this award becoming enforceable. On such reinstatement the workman Basanta Bhuia will not be paid any back wages for that period. But if he is get reinstated within two months of this award becoming enforceable, then the management shall be liable to any him wages of the category in which he was earlier working with effect from the date the award becomes enforceable. However, the order of reinstatement would be subject to the condition that the workman has not reached the age of superannuation and is physically and mentally fit to do the work he was doing before his absence.

18. The aforesaid is the award.

Under the circumstance of the case there would be no order as to the cost.

P. K. SINHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 अप्रैल, 1995

का. प्रा. 1265.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, ठेका श्रम (विनियम और उत्पादन) अधिनियम, 1970 (1970 का 37) की धारा 31 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निर्देश देती है कि भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 22 दिसम्बर, 1979 में पृष्ठ 3593 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. प्रा. 4077, तारीख 15 दिसम्बर

1979 की अनुसूची की मद 1 इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए मामलुह चैरा सीमेंट लिमिटेड की मद सूनापत्थर खान (कैप्टिव लाइमस्टोन माइन्स) को लागू नहीं होगी।

[फा. सं. एल.-16012/3/91-एल. डब्ल्यू.]

एस. के. सिन्हा, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th April, 1995

S.O. 1265.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 31 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (37 of 1970), the Central

Government directs that item 1 of the Schedule to the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 4077 dated the 15th December, 1979, published at page 3593 in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 22nd December, 1979 shall not apply to Capative Limestone Mines of Mawmulh Cherra Cement Ltd, for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

[F. No. S-16012/3/91-LW]

S. K. SINHA, Dy. Secy.

